FBIS DAILY REPORT

CONTENTS

Soviet Union

Vol III No 157 *12 August 1983*

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

DISARMAMENT/START/MBFR

Soviet Disarmament Proposals Overviewed AA 1
[Tomilin in PRAVDA 11 Aug]
U.S. 'Irrational' Nuclear Arms Policy Examined AA 3
[Burlatskiy in LITERATURNAYA GAZETA 10 Aug]

WORLD & REGIONAL ISSUES

Physicians Against Nuclear War Sponsor Discussion CC 1
West's Nuclear Research Aid to Israel, RSA Cited CC 10

UNITED STATES & CANADA

U.S. Military's Worldwide 'Interference' Scored A 1
[Kharkov]
U.S. Underground Nuclear Test Reported A 1
Light Divisions To Play 'World Gendarme' A 2
[Demidov in PRAVDA 11 Aug]
U.S. Chemical Weapons Rearmament Slammed A 2
[Akimov in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 11 Aug]
Marginal Improvement in U.S.-Soviet Ties Seen A 4
[Kuznetsov]

CHINA

U.S. Duplicity Toward PRC Strategic 'Camouflage' B 1
[Barakhta in PRAVDA 11 Aug]
U.S. Taiwan Policy Disregards PRC Interests B 2
NEW TIMES Exposes PRC Press Distortions on DRA B 3

NORTHEAST ASIA

Japan Budgets for F-16 Deployment at Misawa C 1
[Vykhukhalev]
Japan To Transfer 'Military Technology' to U.S. C 1
USSR-DPRK Sign Trade Pact; Trade Doubled in 82 C 2

EASTERN EUROPE

Ustashi Subvert Yugoslavia With Foreign Help F 1
[Ardatovskiy in IZVESTIYA 31 Jul]

WESTERN EUROPE

Italian Economy Benefits From Soviet Trade G 1
[IZVESTIYA 10 Aug]
New Italian Government Rerun of Former One G 1
[Dobrov]
Soviet-Icelandic Officials Discuss Disarmament G 2
[IZVESTIYA 11 Aug]

MIDDLE EAST & NORTH AFRICA

Iran's 'Ali Khamene'i Remarks on USSR Assailed H 1
[Sheftunov]

SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA

U.S. Policy in Chad 'Threat' to All Africans J 1
[Filatov in PRAVDA 11 Aug]
USSR Party, State Delegation Departs for Congo J 1

LATIN AMERICA & CARIBBEAN

RSFSR Paper Hits U.S. 'Militarism' in C. America K 1
[Travkin in SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 11 Aug]
Ecuadoran Ambassador Stresses Peace, Soviet Ties K 3

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

POLITICAL & SOCIAL DEVELOPMENTS

MVD's Fedorchuk on Law and Order Measures R 1
[PRAVDA 10 Aug]
Vorotnikov Chairs RSFSR Government Session R 5
[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 10 Aug]
CPSU's Kunayev Visits Uralsk Oblast Farms R 6
[KAZAKHSTANSKAYA PRAVDA 3 Aug]
Kuznetsov Visits Latvian Agro-Industrial Body R 8
[SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA 3 Aug]
Morality of Economic Leaders Discussed R 8
[Editorial in SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 9 Aug]

SOVIET DISARMAMENT PROPOSALS OVERVIEWED

PM111455 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 11 Aug 83 First Edition p 4

[Yu. Tomilin article: "Precise and Clear Proposals. Disarmament -- A Commandment of the Times"]

[Text] Reducing the nuclear threat and, in the final analysis, totally eliminating it is without a doubt the most important problem in world politics of our time. The USSR proposed and continues to propose constructive initiatives aimed at preventing a nuclear catastrophe. Suffice it to recall that the last UN General Assembly session discussed two new Soviet proposals: "On the Urgent Halting and Banning of Nuclear Weapons Tests" and "Multiplying Efforts to Eliminate the Threat of Nuclear War and Ensuring the Safe Development of Nuclear Energy."

It is well known that our country has pledged not to be the first to use nuclear weapons, and the peoples of the world are rightly expecting corresponding steps by the other nuclear states. If they were to make an equally clear and precise commitment, this would in practical terms be equal to a ban on the use of nuclear weapons.

While doing everything in its power to diminish the threat hanging over mankind, the Soviet Union does not lose sight of the radical task of eliminating the possibility of nuclear war itself, reliably and for all times. Our position in this respect is distinguished by precision and clarity. At the Second UN General Assembly Special Session on Disarmament the USSR submitted the memorandum "Removing the Growing Nuclear Threat and Curbing the Arms Race." This memorandum proposes in particular to develop, adopt, and implement in stages a nuclear disarmament program. In the Soviet side's view, such a program could include:

-- halting the development of new nuclear weapons systems;

-- halting the production of fissionable materials for the purpose of producing different types of nuclear weapons;

-- halting the production of all types of nuclear munitions and delivery vehicles;

-- gradually reducing existing stockpiles of nuclear weapons, including delivery vehicles;

--completely eliminating nuclear weapons.

The Soviet Union has also proposed that the limitation and reduction of nuclear weapons cover all nuclear facilities, above all strategic arms and medium-range facilities. Furthermore, the USSR would be prepared to proceed on a reciprocal basis to make even the very first step in the reduction of nuclear arms -- both strategic and medium-range -- a major step.

A year before the cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki were destroyed by U.S. atomic bombs, Niels Bohr, Nobel Prize winner and world-famous physicist, sent identical letters to the U.S. president and the British prime minister. He wrote: "The greatest significance today lies in the fact that a weapon of unprecedented power is being developed that will completely change the conditions of all future wars.... In actual fact, if some kind of agreement is not concluded in good time to control the use of the new active materials, any temporary advantage -- no matter how great it may be -- could develop into a permanent threat to human society."

The main reason behind today's incomparably more dangerous nuclear arms race is the U.S. desire to secure military superiority and dictate its will to the world. It is only natural that each U.S. attempt to acquire advantage in some type of nuclear arms should be neutralized by retaliatory steps from the Soviet Union. In this process, however, our state, which is not striving for military superiority, limits itself to measures which may be necessary to ensure its own and its allies' security.

The principled and consistent nature of the Soviet Union's position is confirmed by facts. After all, as far back as 1946 our country submitted to the United Nations a proposal to ban the production and use of nuclear weapons, and also to destroy them within a 3-month period. Ever since that time and in parallel with the consolidation of its defense capability, the USSR -- despite the opposition of aggressively-minded circles in the West -- has been struggling to implement real and effective measures to limit and reduce arms, above all nuclear arms. The Soviet Union has proposed and continues to propose the widest range of measures -- from partial to radical -- which would, if implemented, tend to reduce the threat of the outbreak of nuclear war and even the complete disappearance of nuclear weapons and of the nuclear danger with them. An example of such an all-encompassing initiative can be seen in the USSR's 1977 proposal that all nuclear states agree on simultaneously halting the production of all types of nuclear weapons and also on pledging to undertake the gradual reduction of stockpiles of such weapons up to complete liquidation.

The Soviet Union's tireless, peace-loving activity and its struggle for nuclear disarmament have not remained unanswered. Let us recall in particular the concluding document of the First UN General Assembly Special Session on Disarmament which notes: "Nuclear weapons create the greatest danger to mankind and to the further existence of civilization. It is necessary to curb and turn back the nuclear arms race in all its aspects so as to prevent the danger of a war being launched with the use of nuclear seapons. The complete liquidation of nuclear weapons is the ultimate goal in this respect.

How can mankind attain this goal? At the Soviet Union's initiative the UN General Assembly has repeatedly passed resolutions recommending the start of nuclear disarmament talks. In accordance with these resolutions, a special item was included on the Committee on Disarmament agenda proposing the holding of talks on the limitation of nuclear weapons and on nuclear disarmament.

In the course of such talks with the participation of all nuclear powers it could be possible to elaborate a nuclear disarmament program, bearing in mind that the halting of production and the reduction and elimination of nuclear weapons would be implemented gradually on a mutually acceptable and agreed basis. During the process of such talks it could be possible to agree on the measures for each stage and determine the schedules for implementing both the entire program as a whole and its individual stages. There is no doubt that the talks must be conducted with strict adherence to the principles of equality and identical security for the sides, in other words so that during the process of nuclear disarmament not a single state possessing nuclear weapons could gain, even for the briefest of time, direct or indirect one-sided military superiority. Furthermore, no damage must be inflicted on the security interests of nonnuclear states.

The problem of monitoring the implementation of nuclear disarmament measures is an important issue, and the West has repeatedly used it as an obstacle in the way of reaching agreement. This problem must also be resolved in the course of the talks. Taking into consideration the fact that measures aimed at halting the production of nuclear weapons and at reducing and eliminating them would be comprehensive and multistage, the monitoring forms and conditions must correspond with the goals, extent, and nature of the measures being implemented at each stage.

Multilateral talks on nuclear disarmament have not yet begun. They are being blocked mainly by the U.S. Administration which, in its desire to secure military superiority over the Soviet Union, is counting above all on nuclear weapons. The idea that such superiority can be attained is illusory, but it is a dangerous illusion which can only lead to a greater nuclear threat.

Of course, the general talks do not preclude the possibility of reaching a bilateral agreement on the limitation or elimination of any type of nuclear weapons on a mutually-agreeable basis. Furthermore, the results attained on a bilateral basis would be taken into account during the multilateral talks.

The awareness of the fact that nuclear weapons are a deadly threat to civilization determines the USSR's constructive position at the Soviet-U.S. talks on the limitation and reduction of strategic arms and on the limitation of nuclear weapons in Europe. Both of these talks have started after prolonged procrastination by the U.S. Administration. And even now, as the facts show, Washington is not showing the proper readiness to reach agreements based on the principle of equality and identical security of the sides. It continues to strive for military superiority in its favor. It must, however, be clear to all that the Soviet Union will not enter into an agreement which would give the United States a chance to acquire one-sided military advantages.

Nuclear disarmament matters are also on the agenda of the Committee of Disarmament sitting in Geneva. Nevertheless, constructive discussion is being blocked there, too, by the Western countries. The Soviet Union and the other socialist states, with the support of the nonaligned countries, are striving for the earliest initiation of talks aimed at elaborating a nuclear disarmament program. They rely here on recommendations by the UN General Assembly, including that of its latest, 37th, session that such talks be urgently undertaken.

In accordance with instructions from the USSR Supreme Soviet, the Soviet Government recently addressed a proposal to the Governments of the United States, Britain, France, and China, that all powers possessing nuclear weapons freeze all their existing nuclear arms both quantitatively and qualitatively.

The proposal stresses that, in submitting this major initative, the Soviet Union in no way considers a freeze an end in itself, but look on this measure as an effective first step along the road to reducing and, in the final analysis, completely liquidating nuclear arms and thus eliminating entirely the threat of a nuclear catastrophe.

The Soviet initiatives in the cause of elaborating and implementing a nuclear disarmament program, whether they refer to multilateral or bilateral talks, offer a real way out of the vicious circle of the arms race created by U.S. and NATO policy. These initiatives are aimed at consolidating international security, achieving a reduced level of nuclear arms, and, in the final analysis, completely eliminating the nuclear danger.

U.S. 'IRRATIONAL' NUCLEAR ARMS POLICY EXAMINED

PM111426 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 10 Aug 83 p 10

[Article by political observer Fedor Burlatskiy under the rubric "International Life": "War Games"]

[Text] In the last quarter of the 20th century the history of military relations has been becoming more and more irrational. It is impossible to either understand it or explain it from the viewpoint of common sense. This is in striking contrast with the ever deeper penetration of reason into all other spheres of contemporary mankind's life: science and industry, culture and communications.

When President Reagan explained to Congress that he needed 100 MX missiles, each with 10 warheads, not for war and not even for security purposes, but for successful disarmament talks, common sense burst like a soap bubble. Poor Sancho Panza with his simpleton's common sense: What would he have thought if he were to hear the debate on Capitol Hill, where each speaker tried to prove that in order to avoid a nuclear war it is necessary to produce as many nuclear weapons and efficient vehicles for their delivery (where -- to the moon?) as possible, and that all this is just war games and not real preparations for a real war.

Any serious military and political expert, both in the West and in the East, is perfectly aware that a world thermonuclear war has no rational purpose, that it is impossible to achieve victory in it. The downfall of Troy and the destruction of Carthage -- these classic examples from antiquity -- and even the most terrifying example of modern times -- the instantaneous destruction of Hiroshima and Nagasaki -- are nothing in comparison with what could happen in the event of a simultaneous explosion of all 40,000 nuclear charges existing in the world today. At the present speed of the arms race, their number may double by the year 2000. And how many nuclear weapons, with who knows what destructive power, may accumulate in 50 years time, by the year 2030? Can anyone imagine what would happen if all that exploded? Only the destruction of mysterious Atlantis or the Deluge are comparable to such a disaster.

What is particularly dangerous is the fact that no one knows when or how a nuclear war may break out. A technical malfunction in the warning system? An escalation of a regional war? A provocative action by some small power? A fit of insanity in some general? The coming to power of a new Hitler or a MacArthur-type man proposing to drop atomic bombs on Russian cities?

It would seem self-evident that neither the East nor the West can set itself the goal of achieving victory in a thermonuclear conflict. Is this not a common threat, is it not sufficient reason to pool all efforts in the name of averting the disaster?

Today this is not just our opinion. I have heard people reasoning along these lines at numerous conferences on curbing the arms race: in Moscow, Philadelphia, Minneapolis, and at talks with scientists at political research centers in Washington, New York, London, with public figures and participants in antinuclear movements in the United States and in West Europe. There is, as people say, only the small matter of making Mr Reagan, Mrs Thatcher, and then other incumbent leaders in the West understand this, because without them it is, alas, impossible to come to an agreement on the matter.

President Reagan has already said repeatedly and with heartfelt sincerity that he does not love us and he does not trust us. Never mind, let us leave emotions aside and speak as businesslike people. When proposing his military programs, the U.S. President tends to take into account only the selfish interests of his own country and its allies. But is it actually indisputable that these programs benefit the national security of the United States and the other Western countries? This is the truly Hamlet-like question which people with simple common sense in the West ask themselves ever more frequently.

The most rational of all the irrational arguments for continuing the arms race that I have heard involves the inevitability and irreversibility of modernization of nuclear and other weapons and the vehicles for their delivery. In London's [International] Institute for Strategic Studies I spoke with two officers: a tall, lean, and haughty British colonel and a small, lively, sinewy and brisk man in civilian clothes who later turned out to the a U.S. general.

I asked them a naive question, worthy of Sancho Panza: "What could be the ceiling for nuclear weapons stockpiles? How many warheads must the West have to 'contain' the Soviet Union? Thirty thousand? Forty? A hundred thousand?"

I got the impression that my interlocutors were shocked by the question. The colonel told me that no one can know how many nuclear warheads would be needed, since it is impossible to curb the process of weapons modernization or the scientific and technical process in general. "One thing is clear: we must have no fewer than the Soviet Union," the British man remarked. "It would be good to have even a few more, and better ones," the American said with a merry grin. But why is this necessary? And who needs this?

It is not difficult to prove that the constant modernization of weapons is in the interest of one or another social group in the West. This is a vein of gold for the owners of military monopolies. One can imagine that the workers in the plants and scientific laboratories producing the weapons are in deadly fear of the discontinuance of production. Quite probably the egghead intellectuals -- as people in the U.S. refer to the physicists, chemists, and mathematicians who ponder day and night how to better organize the extermination of mankind with the help of science -- are shocked by the very idea that research in this sphere may come to an end: this would be a blow to their prestige, their influence, and their incomes.

The generals are particularly perturbed; they must be quite pleased by the naughty idea of possessing some kind of a trick to make the White House and Capitol Hill, with all the Capitol denizens, disappear instantaneously. To take the MX away from the generals means to take away a part of their power, to take away their future.

But how does the activity of these groups affect U.S. national security? I would bet on proving that all the frenzy of private interests over the last 40 years has done nothing but ruin their country's security. Their colossal profits, their mysterious schemes, and their unheard-of diligence have a negative vector. This is movement in a direction opposite to the security of the U.S. people and of peoples in other countries.

Here is some simple reasoning, and let anyone try and refute it. I claim that in 1945, at the moment of the historic choice regarding the prospects of nuclear weapons, the United States was in a state of total security: no one was in a position to seriously threaten the United States, or that country's territory or people. Had the United States given up the production of nuclear weapons and concluded an agreement with the USSR, its security would only have been consolidated.

But the temptation of nuclear superiority was great and the U.S. leaders succumbed to it. Twenty years of involvement in a thermonuclear race went by, and in 1965 U.S. military experts reached the conclusion that no fewer than 60-80 million Americans would die as a result of the "exchange of nuclear strikes." Fifteen more years passed and this figure increased to 120-130 million. One need not be a prophet to foresee that in another 10-15 years' time the threat will hang over the entire population of the United States, as well as over all other peoples and countries.

It is, finally, necessary to understand the difference between political arithmetic and political algebra. A new situation emerged after the elimination of the U.S. atomic monopoly, and even more so after the establishment of a military equilibrium between East and West. Nuclear might on the one side automatically stimulates nuclear might on the other side. And insofar as this might is exclusively destructive, it automatically steps up the danger for both sides and for the inhabitants of the entire globe.

President Eisenhower was the main member of the U.S. political leadership who tried to extract a rational gloss from the hopeless nuclear race equation, a race started at his country's initiative. He immediately recognized the doctrine of nuclear deterrence. It consists of the premise that it is necessary to possess only so many nuclear weapons as would be necessary, in the case of first strike by the enemy, to retain a capacity to inflict upon him irreparable (catastrophic) damage by a retaliatory strike. The rational aspect of the deterrent doctrine, if we were to understand it correctly, is that there are limits to the thermonuclear race: when the sides have reached a certain level and are capable of delivering a retaliatory strike, there is no further need to continue the stockpiling of nuclear weapons.

President Kennedy was the first U.S. leader to appreciate the truth that the time may come when human life would disappear from the face of our planet. After him, President Nixon, as well as Carter at the beginning of his presidency, began to understand the need to agree with the USSR on the limitation of the nuclear arms race. The strategic equilibrium of forces created in the seventies stimulated a number of important agreements: on the nonproliferation of nuclear arms; the SALT I treaty; and finally the SALT II treaty, which has not been ratified through the fault of the United States. Historic decisions were taken in Helsinki.

The present U.S. leadership is striving to cancel out this experience and is seeking a new concept to replace the formula of mutual deterrence. Such a formula is provided by the strategic doctrine of so-called nuclear survival, which knows of no limits in the arms race.

This is what incumbent U.S. Vice President Bush said recently: "It is necessary to ensure a chance for survival for the Supreme Command, a chance to protect the industrial potential and guarantee the defense of a certain percentage of civilians, and to possess such numbers of weapons as would ensure greater losses by the enemy than what he could inflict upon us -- this is the way in which the victor in a nuclear war will emerge." And Bush defines the number of those who could possibly survive: "Over five percent, even in the event that both sides launch all stockpiles at their disposal!"

And so, 5 percent will manage to survive the effect of a nuclear war. Who will be among the happy people in the postnuclear age? Well, some of them were mentioned by the Vice President himself. They are the political and military leaders. But there are not all that many of them, a few thousand all together. Then, probably, will come the richest and most influential people in the United States. But even they are calculated to be not more than one percent of the population. Who will comprise the remaining four percent? You can imagine the crush among the expansive Americans when the time comes to start issuing survival tickets....

Actually, what will be the color of the tickets? White? No, it is associated with white death. Red? But it has terrible associations with the enemy's colors. Could it be brown? But mankind has already experienced the brown hues. Then maybe yellow -- the color of mental instability, which is most suitable for people who speak so lightly of the consequences of nuclear war?...

Could it be possible that the new military programs planned in the United States are capable of bringing something new and efficient into the security system of that country and its allies? It is easy to see that this is not the case.

I claim -- and let the Western experts disprove this -- that the military programs currently implemented or planned in the United States will result in a three-stage descent into the abyss of destabilization and further destruction of the security of the United States, let alone its European allies.

The first stage is the installation of Pershing II and cruise missiles in West European countries; the second is the construction of MX and Trident II missiles; and the third is the plans that are ripening to deploy nuclear weapons in outer space.

It has already been said repeatedly that the deployment of U.S. cruise and Pershing II missiles in Europe will radically alter the balance of forces at a strategic level, since they are capable of reaching Soviet territory within 6-8 minutes. This undisputably leads to strategic instability.

Nonetheless, the Americans have already started the production of, according to different sources, 6,000-12,000 cruise missiles. These missiles are tempting because of two of their characteristics: invisibility to radar and low production costs. I was told in the United States that the cost of one such missile is one-thousandth of the cost of a B-1 bomber.

But here is a question which is broadly discussed by U.S. experts: to what extent do the cruise missiles consolidate the security of the United States itself? It is explained that they are a two-edged sword. A highly authoritative U.S. specialist told me: "I do not understand how our strategists think. The cruise missile is of small caliber and is mobile. When it becomes part of the USSR armaments -- and this is unavoidable -- there will emerge an inevitable threat against my country. Any merchant ship, any fishing boat can be armed with such missiles. Cruising in the U.S. coastal waters, thay can cross our entire territory from west to east and from east to west in a matter of minutes." A rather curious revelation, is it not?

And how about the MX missile -- is it dangerous only for the USSR? The military advantage of this missile consists of the fact that it can carry 10 warheads and has a more accurate, flexible, and efficient guidance system. But, in the opinion of U.S. experts, this missile is exceptionally vulnerable. It is sufficient for the enemy to use only 100 charges to destroy 1,000 warheads.

Furthermore, and the U.S. experts are well aware of this, the USSR is capable of producing a missile of similar capacity, should it consider this expedient. In other words, by installing 100 MX missiles against the USSR, President Reagan is simultaneously stimulating the installation of 100 MX analogues against his own country. And what does the United States gain?

But the most fantastic program involves the deployment of nuclear weapons in outer space. On 23 March President Reagan delivered a speech about space warfare which is, without any doubt, the most risky and most dangerous of all the military ventures by the present administration.

The technical details of this plan can be read in a 175-page document, completely seemly in appearance, published last year by the right wing organization, the Heritage Foundation. This report was written by Lieutenant General Daniel Graham, former director of the U.S. Defense Intelligence Agency. The report vindicates the transition from the current doctrine of "mutual assured destruction" to the doctrine of "guaranteed survival."

How does the general see this method of survival? He recommends the creation of a system comprising 400 satellites in permanent orbit round the earth and armed with a whole range of deadly ray gun systems capable of destroying Soviet missiles within 5 minutes of launching. These ray gun systems would include systems using light rays boosted by hydrogen flouride lasers, as well as systems using nuclear particle clusters and X-rays generated by nuclear explosions and adjusted by laser, microwaves, and the electromagnetic impulses caused by nuclear explosions. Furthermore, Graham suggests that the Pentagon launch into orbit killer satellites capable of blinding and destroying Soviet satellites in outer space and deploy land-based "energy guns" capable of shooting down enemy missiles before they reach the United States.

Suppose for a minute that the Americans manage to be the first to create a halfway efficient space defense system and thus diminish the efficiency of the retaliatory nuclear strike; this would present a temptation, very difficult to resist, to the U.S. military and politicians: deliver a first strike and finish off the enemy once and for all. On the other hand, the Soviet Union and its allies will be faced with a completely different military and political dilemma. In other words, space weapons are provocative weapons; they are unquestionably a "casus belli" [printed in Latin] for a nuclear war.

The human mind would be incapable of controlling the space system. Decisions would have to be taken in a matter of seconds and thousands of components would have to be taken into account. These decisions would have to be entrusted to a computer. Robots would acquire absolute power over the fate of humanity. Our lesser brothers -- the animals -- will be at long last avenged for man's centuries-long domination over them. The mechanical brain will decide whether humanity will exist on earth or not.

And here, at last, we come to the ultimate goal of the nuclear competition: Let everything be decided by "beings" of a more perfect and higher breed -- robots....

Is it not true, though, that the pictures of the war of the worlds painted by H.G. Wells pale in comparison with this fantasy? In exactly the same way, the image of the solitary engineer from Kafka's famous novel, inventor of a machine which tortures a living man, pales in comparison with the authors of today's war plans. Could it be that the space age is also the age of military science fiction?... But should we, then, be in such a hurry to enter this age?...

In ancient times people used to say: He whom the Gods would destroy they first make mad. Political reason is really in short supply in the West. Here is yet another syllogism in defense of the nuclear arms race: "Yes, nuclear war is irrational, but this does not mean that the nuclear race is irrational. The champions of this viewpoint claim that the A-bomb has become a political weapon. It helps them achieve perfectly real goals: on the one hand in the struggle against the USSR and its allies, and on the other hand in consolidating the unity of Western alliances. As we can see, inventive political thought seeks and finds any arguments to continue the war games.

A British scientist told me that President Reagan, in talks with conservative British lions and lionesses, threatened that, by accelerating the military competition, he would drive the Russian bear into a corner: let the Soviet people feel what hunger means. Here it is, at last, the charitable goal of U.S. policy!

But this goal is no more rational than the consolidation of U.S. security through war in space. No one has yet managed to drive the "Russian bear" into a corner. Ask the last ones who tried -- the German fascists.

Of course, the arms race is a heavy burden for us. It diverts means from the peaceful production sectors. But no one will manage to disrupt the military parity that has been achieved. Yu.V. Andropov has warned about this in most responsible terms. And any realistic politician must bear this in mind as a fact which cannot be altered or ignored.

But military-economic games with the "Russian bear" are by no means the latest White House invention. The confrontation with the USSR is used more and more often by the United States as a trump card in the games with its NATO allies. The Williamsburg conference was an obvious example of this.

The conference results are interesting as an attempt in skillful political balancing. Just imagine: Authoritative leaders from the capitalist world gather to resolve, even if only partially, the acute economic problems of relations between their countries. These problems are not resolved; they are pushed aside, and instead a document is adopted which is meant to prove that unity is still somehow maintained in the struggle against the USSR and the other socialist countries.

Famous U.S. scientist I. Wallerstein, chief of the Center for Studies of the Economic Aspects of Historical Systems and Civilizations, has remarked subtly: "A conflict between the Western countries is developing behind the East-West conflict. Reagan's policy is clear and, in its own way, clever: Regenerate the 'Cold War,' exploit the tension in relations with the USSR to the detriment of the European allies... so that in reality he could restore influence in West Europe. In my view, for 10 years now U.S. foreign policy has pursued one main goal: to prevent West Europe from leaving the orbit which forces it to revolve around Washington."

I do not know whether this is the main goal of present U.S. policy, but there is no doubt that it is one of the central tasks which is used as an important argument in favor of the nuclear race and confrontation between East and West.

But is this strategy sensible? Will it last long? Is the risk of a nuclear war commensurate with the temporary side issues? Is it sensible to insist at the Geneva talks, like Shylock, on each pound of nuclear flesh as if neither side had enough of it? The White House strategists should think all this over yet again.

Lastly, our opponents often tell us: "And are you not doing exactly the same thing as the Americans? Are you not stockpiling deadly weapons and modernizing them?"

I am convinced that such people either do not understand or else ignore the fundamental difference between U.S. and USSR positions. Our actions are retaliatory; we take our lead from Washington which, since 1945, has been aiming its nuclear gun barrels at us. They were the first to create the atomic bomb, the nuclear submarine, the aircraft carrier loaded with thermonucleonics, the cruise missile, and so on. And now they are calculating on being the first with the MX missile and the space system which would enable them to be ahead for a year, a day, or even an hour.

So what are we to do -- offer our undefended cheek in the hope of nuclear charity? We had and still have the sacred and undisputable right to justifiable self-defense.

But at some point it is necessary to stop so that the war game launched by the United States does not escalate into a monstrous and unimaginable mushroom engulfing the planet. There is only one way out: Stop the nuclear race and take the path of freezing the nuclear arsenals.

PHYSICIANS AGAINST NUCLEAR WAR SPONSOR DISCUSSION

OW111045 Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian 1105 GMT 10 Aug 83

["Illusion of Nuclear Superiority" discussion program held in the framework of the "International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War" congress at the Free University near Amsterdam; with Olof Palme, prime minister of Sweden; Academician Georgiy Arkadyevich Arbatov; Admiral Noel Gayler, former commander of U.S. Armed Forces in the Pacific; and Egon Bahr, chairman of the FRG Bundestag Subcommission for Disarmament and Arms Control; Academician Yevgeniy Ivanovich Chazov introduces the program in Russian; discussion participants speak in English with superimposed Russian translation -- date not given]

[Text] [Chazov] Today everyone in the world must strictly determine whether he sides with those who silently and indifferently look on while certain military and political figures in the West bring the world to the abyss called nuclear war, or with those who actively support peace and who actively fight to prevent nuclear war.

This is even more important for physicians whose professional duty is to safeguard health and life. Following from this, a group of physicians -- there were not many of them -- organized an international movement of physicians advocating the prevention of nuclear war 3 years ago. Two congresses were held: one in the United States and the second in Britain, where for the first time -- I shall speak frankly -- in the history of mankind, specific data was presented on the medical consequences of nuclear war.

The essence of this movement lies not only in studying, on the basis of accurate scientific data, what will happen to mankind, what will happen to each one of us, if nuclear war breaks out; this movement's task is also to explain to the peoples of the world this data obtained by physicians.

The movement's third congress, which was held in the Netherlands, already represented the movement in 41 countries of the world. I must say that data available now indicates that today, if the nuclear arms race is not stopped and if the constant buildup of nuclear capabilities is not ceased, then this could lead to a very sad outcome not only for individual countries, but for all mankind and the entire world.

Representatives of 41 countries met in a small town near Amsterdam. These were people of various nationalities and political and religious views, but they were united by one thing: a desire to prevent nuclear war. In this town, far from the noisy streets of Amsterdam and turbulent life, physicians studied, on the basis of accurate scientific data, the medical consequences of what would happen if 572 missiles were deployed in Western Europe and a reciprocal strike on these missile installations occurred [i proizoydet otvetnyy udar po etim raketnym ustanovkam].

It was again declared in this small town that medicine would be powerless if nuclear war broke out, and if this catastrophe did in fact occur, mankind would be faced with the dilemma: to be or not to be. For precisely this reason it was proposed that a number of political figures from the West and East appear in an open discussion at the third congress. [applause]

[Palme] It is a great honor for me to be here. Your organization has done enormous work. My role here is very modest and I will allow myself only a few introductory words.

The buildup of nuclear arsenals is continuing. Much time passed before people began to react to this growing threat to their very existence and before they discovered that nuclear weapons bring entirely new dimensions to questions of life and peace.

But they have discovered it now, and now they demonstrate and protest.

The impressive part of this protest is the role played by various professional groups, the primary example being this very audience: physicians. They have discovered this threat to their profession. They have made an enormous contribution to our understanding of what nuclear war could signify.

Recently a group of medical experts working for health services completed their research on the consequences of nuclear war. Their conclusion was simple. Not a single health service in any country could assist the hundreds of thousands of people seriously injured after an explosion of even one 1-megaton bomb. Even the deaths and injuries that would result from an accidental explosion of one bomb in the enormous weapons arsenals could be beyond the resources of medical services. Therefore, the illusion that medicine will be able to treat people and help them in case of disaster is in itself a threat.

Another example is a military one. Before the advent of the nuclear age there were winners and losers in wars. Some viewed open conflict as a continuation of diplomacy. At least conflicts could be stopped after talks were held. But the arms race undermines the possibility of talks and of a peaceful settlement.

After the outbreak of nuclear war there will be no turning back. Today, even military people believe that nuclear superiority is an illusion. Nuclear weapons have transformed the very concept of war. In this nuclear age no nation can ensure security with the help of nuclear superiority insofar as no nation can defend itself from nuclear attack. Therefore there will be only losers in a war. This has dispelled illusions even among representatives of the military profession.

On the plane I read the statement by Mr William Colby, former CIA director, who has changed his point of view. He now supports the freeze of nuclear arms. We must find new principles of security based on a mutual and universal interest in avoiding nuclear war.

Political and ideological opponents must work together to avoid nuclear war. Either they survive together or they will perish together. Nuclear war will not end with one side winning, but with mutual destruction. Therefore security in the nuclear age means security for all, and I hope this will be the topic of our discussion today. Participating will be Admiral Gayler from the United States, Academician Georgiy Arbatov from the USSR, and Egon Bahr from the FRG. [applause]

[Gayler] I think everyone understands that we are in trouble. This intensive and growing arms race has caused a disintegration of relations between East and West. I do not plan to blame someone for this; it would be useless. What we must do is realize that nuclear weapons are a common enemy of us all. I plan to say a few words about the nature of nuclear weapons, about the illusions we have regarding ways out of the situation in which we now find ourselves, and about the responsibility we all share for ensuring that a way out be found.

I have a long and personal familiarity with nuclear weapons. I saw Hiroshima 6 days after the bomb was dropped there. I took part in nuclear weapons tests in the atmosphere in the Pacific Ocean, and there is something in these nuclear explosions that cannot be conveyed by either words, photographs, or descriptions. I think that unfortunately there are not many state leaders who have ever seen how these things explode or have a visual impression of that they represent. I also took part in nuclear weapons targeting tests and had a commander's responsibility. The more you learn about these weapons, the less you like them. [applause] You become increasingly convinced that they have no sensible military application. I must tell you that I thought that this was already universally known.

Nuclear weapons are genocidal weapons and cannot be used sensibly. They irreversibly poison the land, water, the life-giving air, and plants, and always come back to those who use them.

In my opinion three conditions are necessary for the outbreak of nuclear war: In order to be able to destroy the enemy and his children it is essential to immunize and dehumanize him for a long period of time. Second, at least one or possibly both enemies must be mortally frightened. Third, the sides must experience illusions concerning the nature of nuclear weapons.

Permit me to tell you what illusions I have in mind. One is that with the present level of nuclear armaments their quantity is supposedly significant. This is not so. If you were to count the number of people who would perish during a general exchange of nuclear blows it is immaterial whether or not these blows were targeted intentionally at cities, whether the weapons exploded on the ground or in the air, in which direction the wind was blowing, or where it was carrying the radioactive fallout.

It is also an illusion that nuclear weapons can be clearly divided into strategic and tactical ones. This kind of division is absolutely unfounded and is an obstacle to achieving sensible agreements on limiting arms. As a matter of fact, nuclear weapons are all alike. It is also irrelevant where the weapons are launched from, only where they land is important. [applause]

Modernization is also an illusion. We can recognize legitimate reasons for modernization and a desire to make certain kinds of nuclear weapons safer, to reduce their vulnerability, or ensure more reliable control over their use. Other than these reasons, there is nothing which could necessitate replacement or modernization, like buying a new car, for instance. It really is not like that at all.

Another illusion is that some kind of magic shield can exist in the form of civil defense means. In my opinion civil defense will save neither the United States nor the Soviet Union. It cannot be a defense against nuclear attack.

Finally, the worst illusion of all is the opinion that only experts have a right to make judgments in these matters. [applause] I can be considered an expert and I assure you that there has never been a sphere in which common sense was more applicable for solving problems. The problems we face can be solved, but to do this we must discard the illusions I have mentioned. The United States and the USSR must build their relations on the basis of extremely important mutual interests. First, we must not be blown up. Second, neither of us need the proliferation of nuclear weapons throughout the world. We must base our agreements on these interests.

I will venture to propose several plans for the doctors in the audience. First, we must stop the exchange of threats and insults which hinders mutual understanding, dialogue, and agreement and has no point. Second, we must reject attempts to prejudice one another. It would be wrong to think that causing detriment to the USSR would be advantageous to the United States, or that injury to the United States would be advantageous to the USSR. Together we can do much that would be advantageous to both our countries, but together we can also do something which would be enormously damaging. I have in mind, for example, the continuation of the arms race. I also think we must not try to fish in troubled waters, in Central America and the Middle East. For example, we should also not try to exert pressure by not taking part in nuclear arms talks.

Dangerous deployments of armaments should be rejected.

I seriously hope that we will be able to achieve a mutual and balanced reduction of conventional forces and arms in Europe and break the impasse the talks have been in for the past 9 years. We ought to admit that there is no such thing as a sensible use of nuclear weapons; therefore, we should reject doctrines recognizing the possibility of waging nuclear war as well as doctrines of counterforce, with all the dangers they entail.

We ought to establish a moratorium on the development, testing, and deployment of nuclear weapons while talks are being held on serious reductions of these weapons and other agreements. We in the United States could also pledge not to use nuclear weapons first. I draw your attention to the fact that this would have real consequences: It would not simply be a nominal agreement insofar as a pledge of this sort would require new decisions on weapons which are planned to be deployed, on the deployment of nuclear arms as such, and on military doctrines and the nature of maneuvers.

After careful discussions we could reach agreement on nuclear-free zones and we can carry out a massive reduction of nuclear arms which both powers possess in such a way that there would be no doubt that they have been destroyed forever. In the long run we can strengthen security for all of us. This security would be freedom from coercion through the use or threat of use of military force.

My plan for the Soviet Union is for its conventional forces to be moved deep into its territory. The West should end its reliance on nuclear weapons as a means of defense; this is an empty bluff.

Finally, I think we need a universal and comprehensive agreement on limiting nuclear arms between the superpowers which other nuclear powers can also join. In the long run, each one should have a minimum number of invulnerable deterrent nuclear means with the hope that some day a level of trust will be established and we will be able to get rid of nuclear weapons entirely.

I am convinced that man is capable of freeing himself from the trap he has created. We are not helpless and the responsibility for this to happen rests on us all. Thank you. [applause]

[Palme] I now give the floor to Georgiy Arbatov from the Soviet Union.

[Arbatov] This morning while listening to the greetings received by the congress I thought that if everything is so good, then why is everything so bad? [laughter and applause] Really, in addition to warm greeting from the pope, the conference received greetings from President Andropov and even from President Reagan, as well as from Papandreou, Zhivkov, Sorsa, and Koivisto. I think that the coordinated actions of only two governments -- the United States and the Soviet Union -- could greatly change the state of affairs, if, of course, a sympathy for the cause for which we are gathered here and a genuine desire to move things in this sphere were manifested. I remember one quotation from the quotations from Chairman Mao Zedong: A table will not move until you move it. [laughter] We must be well aware, as I think everyone is, of how serious and even threatening the situation really is. The negotiations between the USSR and the United States are at an impasse; do not believe anyone who tries to tell you otherwise.

You know, today we received another greeting, we learned of the first test of the MX missile in the Marshall Islands. Besides the MX it is planned to deploy sea- and ground-based cruise missiles as early as next year. The plan is extensive: It includes B-1 bombers, Stealth aircraft, Trident-2, and even a fantastic antimissile system that has been called "Star Wars" in the United States.

The admiral may note that Soviet arms also exist. I do not plan to refute this and believe that there are no good nuclear weapons.

Any nuclear weapons, Western, Eastern, or others, are bad. [applause] But if the other side develops new weapons, we will do everything in our power to also develop them. This could happen in 3, 4, or 5 years, but it will inevitably occur.

Increasingly less time is available to stop the new arms race. We are on a path of confrontation. The situation could get worse as early as this year. We are speaking about illusions today. One of them -- I think the Americans suffer from it -- is that success at the talks on limiting and reducing strategic arms is possible even with a complete failure of the talks on nuclear arms in Europe. This is not true. If hundreds of new U.S. nuclear missiles are deployed in Europe then they will be intermediate-range weapons only for the Americans. For us they will be strategic arms, very strategic, just as strategic as the Minuteman-2, the Polaris, Poseidon, or Trident missiles. How can a reduction be discussed positively, especially a significant reduction of strategic arms, under conditions where the other side is increasing them?

I think that another illusion is rife in Europe. Many Europeans believe that with the deployment of U.S. missiles the Russians will become more compliant. This is also untrue. If deployment starts it will become far more difficult, even politically, for both sides to do something. I am afraid that if deployment begins, the process of talks on limiting arms will halt, at least for some time.

At the morning session I thought about how much the situation has changed inasmuch as the U.S. Government sent the congress a greeting. I think that one of the major reasons is that you physicians have achieved much, as have other antinuclear movements. [applause] You helped create a psychological atmosphere in which it has become simply indecent to speak about military superiority. It became necessary to at least invent some milder, more vague term, such as a reserve of security [rezerv bezopastnosti]. Arms limitation has become a good policy even in the United States in terms of winning votes, particularly before the presidential elections. It is probably not by chance that this congress received greetings not only from the U.S. President but also from almost every presidential candidate: Mondale, Glenn, and others.

I think that this in itself is evidence of success. The words have already changed. But I think that Doctor Lown was quite correct when he said that it is necessary to change not only the words, but also the deeds. Besides, there is not that much time for this.

A few words about the illusion of nuclear superiority. I consider it to be very dangerous because it can exist only in conjunction with other illusions; for example, illusions that it is supposedly possible to wage a nuclear war and win it. Only by believing this can one strive for nuclear superiority in the present situation.

Superiority has almost become an obscene word, but we must look attentively at only not words, but also concepts. It is precisely in them that the ideas of military superiority are expressed. We must not forget this. The Soviet Union's attitude to the idea of nuclear superiority is probably known to the audience. We consider it impossible to achieve superiority and senseless to strive for it. This is probably clear. The matter here lies not only in our good nature; I admit that perhaps not everyone here will attribute this to us; I draw your attention to facts.

We were forced to pursue the Americans and could not think of superiority in 1945, in the fifties, the sixties, and the seventies. Keep in mind that when we talk of parity, we are, in my opinion, extremely generous. We have a considerably smaller population and even, according to authoritative Western sources, spend a lot less on armament. We also have less personnel in our Armed Forces. I am not mentioning this because we want parity with all our possible opponents as a whole.

This is impossible and we understand this. We consider that what we have now is sufficient and we would agree to have much less if agreements were reached on a mutual reduction of conventional and nuclear arms.

Finally, I would like to speak about the biggest illusion of the nuclear age. In the realm of international relations, we have entered the nuclear age with a Stone Age mentality. This is a most dangerous situation. Although there are international laws, the history of wars has shown that more often than not it is the law of the jungle that prevails. This should have been stopped long ago, but even more so now, both for moral reasons and because it corresponds with the vital interests of us all. We must learn to think and act otherwise. This has now become a condition for our survival.

There are many other illusions. The admiral mentioned some of them and others were discussed here this morning. But the biggest of all is the illusion that you can supposedly learn to live with nuclear weapons and live with them forever. I remember in 1941 when I was 18 years old I was at the front, I took part in the war with the fascists. At the time I heard tales and read articles about how Soviet aircraft were shot down and in some cases the pilots survived even though their parachutes failed to open. In one case the aircraft crashed seconds earlier and the shock wave softened the pilot's fall, in another the pilot fell on a long snow-covered slope. These were facts. But if anyone were to conclude on the basis of this that it is possible to simply jump from high-flying aircraft in this way, it would be a typical psychiatric case. [laughter, applause]

I think it would be only a little less insane to believe that if people have survived the nuclear age behaving as they have done for the past 38 years, they can go on living safely while continuing to behave in this way. It is not only because of state wisdom that we have survived, it is also because of luck. And we cannot test luck too long. [applause]

[Palme] I now give the floor to their third speaker, Egon Bahr.

[Bahr] I can agree with almost every word by the previous speakers concerning an analysis of the situation. But even if we agree with what has been said, this does not yet indicate the direction which must be followed -- that is the first thing. Secondly, Arbatov said that the hope that you can live and survive forever while nuclear weapons exist is an illusion. But I do not have nuclear weapons and therefore I can do nothing to eliminate them. The same thing applies to this gathering of physicians. Only two superpowers can do this: The United States and the Soviet Union. That is the first thing. Second, I think it should not be forgotten that it was not the politicians who brought nuclear weapons into our world. These weapons were invented by scientists, but it is precisely the politicians who bear the weight of responsibility for the solution of the problem which they themselves did not create.

This is an extremely complicated matter because politicians are ordinary, normal people. They are not heroes or giants and they must first learn what the scientists' invention can lead to.

It is a fact that politicians have so far been unable to create an absolutely secure situation in a world which possesses nuclear arms. Even if we speak only about the most simple weapons, like the bomb dropped on Hiroshima in 1945, they have not learned to completely control even this kind of weapon. Meanwhile missiles, lasers, and plans to use space have appeared. It has become very difficult for the politicians to understand the essence of the problem which was created by others.

Third, I remember that General De Gaulle said: The sovereignty of a country in this age is determined by whether or not it can decide for itself questions of nuclear arms.

In our nuclear age, of course, this is the ultimate sovereignty and this sovereignty will never be shared with another country simply because you will not entrust the solution of questions of your own existence to another.

Precisely because of this neither the United States nor the Soviet Union, France nor Britain, have ever shared or offered to share decisions on questions of how and when to use nuclear weapons with another country. This is a very interesting point. Admiral Gayler said that it does not matter from where weapons are launched. For the Soviet Union this means that it makes no difference whether American nuclear weapons launched in the United States fall on its territory or if American nuclear weapons are launched from German territory or French ones from French territory. The important thing, Gayler said, is only where they will explode.

But this means that in case nuclear weapons are launched from German territory -- although the Germans cannot decide about the use of these weapons -- the reaction of the Soviet Union will be the same. This brings me to the conclusion that it is becoming completely intolerable and unacceptable when people and countries cannot decide issues relating to their physical existence, when they become hostages whose fate depends on decisions made in other countries. [applause] This conclusion has brought me to a proposal: No nuclear weapons on the territories of those countries which do not possess these weapons themselves. [applause]

One of the first steps in this direction could be the establishment of a nuclear-free corridor across Europe. The commission chaired by Olof Palme proposed the establishment of such a corridor. This would be an important measure for strengthening confidence, that is the first point. Second, it would help raise the threshold of nuclear threat, insofar as today, according to General Rogers, supreme commander of NATO forces, he would be obliged to use tactical nuclear weapons during the first few hours after the outbreak of a conflict. In other words, we live in a situation in which the nuclear threshold may be crossed within hours in the case of a conflict, without knowing what awaits beyong that threshold. Point number three: We cannot find either the measures or the means to control such a situation. Therefore, I think that one of the possibilities in this direction will be the establishment of a limited nuclear-free zone in Europe.

Now my last remark. The talks in Geneva are important not because the numbers of weapons are being discussed at them, but I think that these talks possibly carry the people's last hope that the question of these accursed nuclear weapons and the arms race can be solved through negotiations. If the talks fail, many people may become desperate, desperate because this problem cannot be solved by diplomatic means.

Therefore, I think that we are obliged to promote a more energetic pursuit of these talks in Geneva. We hope that they will lead to the expected results, although I am not sure of this yet. Thank you. [applause]

[Palme] I think that we could start from a small theoretical question. They say that the world has been saved with the help of mutual deterrence. But now one is forced to listen more and more often to something else: that this kind of mutual fear is in reality a factor increasingly threatening peace insofar as deterrence promotes the arms race and the exacerbation of hatred between the two blocs. I would like to ask the participants what they think of this factor, the factor of restraint through deterrence, particularly nuclear deterrence?

[Gayler] It is an obvious truism that nuclear deterrence is better than nuclear war. To move towards invulnerable deterrence in order to restrain nuclear war is far safer than the situation we are in now. In this sense, nuclear deterrence and nuclear restraint have many merits, at least as a stage on the way to something better to which we should aspire now.

We can achieve it only through negotiations. They are in the interests of the Soviet Union, in the interests of the United States, in the interests of Europe, and in the interests of the whole world.

[Arbatov] I think that nuclear deterrence is not so much someone's invention -- of the military, politicians, or strategists -- as a rationalization of a new fact of life. These nuclear weapons exist and these weapons instill fear.

Some theories appearing on this basis were quite substantial for their time and I think they played a certain positive role because this somehow defined a mutually acceptable code of nuclear conduct understood and recognized by both sides: Weapons can serve as a means of threat but should not be used. At the same time, I think that restraint by means of deterrence contained, like many other notions, the seeds of self-destruction. First of all, in order to deter it is necessary to have more and more weapons, and moreover, ever more perfect weapons. The desire for perfection is too deeply ingrained in the human psyche. Another point needed in order that the deterrence factor can play its role is that you must make the enemy believe you are capable of committing suicide, that you are capable of irrational behavior if something should occur. This plays a certain role in politics, in the arms race, in political behavior, and even in rhetoric.

I do not think that someone is to blame for this, but now the concept of deterrence, it seems to me, is going through a crisis. A lot more weapons have been created than are necessary for deterrence. The threat to destroy ten of the enemy's largest cities would possibly be good deterrence, by all human standards. But now 50,000 units of nuclear weapons have been created and this is still not enough. From this crossroads -- and here I do not agree with the admiral -- we cannot simply return to deterrence of a past lower level. Possibly this is conceivable, but only as an intermediate stage.

In principle, a decision must be made as to how to proceed, and there are some at this crossroads who choose to support the establishment of a potential which they hope will permit the waging of a nuclear war and victory in it. Now, this is a very dangerous trend of attack against the concept of nuclear deterrence and restraint. You should not believe everyone who comes out against nuclear deterrence. Among its critics are many bad people who in reality want to repudiate deterrence in favor of a concept of waging a nuclear war.

At the same time we cannot simply return to the past. In order to achieve success, a major success at the arms limitation talks, we possibly must rebuild the entire structure of relations between the United States and the Soviet Union, or even the entire structure of international relations as a whole. It is important to understand this. We cannot survive by relying simply on technical means. We must rebuild the entire system of international relations, and the future will not be very easy. We must solve many problems, economic and ecological problems, Third World problems, and so forth. This demands cooperation and it requires that we do not bleed one another away in the arms race. All of this is an imperative requirement of our time. [applause]

[Bahr] I think that nuclear deterrence was only effective while we had only strategic nuclear assets that were so terrible that one could not imagine that they would ever be used. In the last 20 years a great number of small nuclear assets have been developed that are more accurate than their forerunners; their miniaturization has also miniaturized the reality of nuclear deterrence. It seems that the use of these weapons will not lead to disaster for all mankind and will not destroy all the people on earth. Thus, the idea of a nuclear war limited only to Europe was born and people began to think of how to win this limited war by using these smaller nuclear warheads. Both the admiral and Arbatov said that small-caliber nuclear assets should not be used because it was not known what their use would lead to.

However, there are people who think differently and who could take advantage of these assets if they think it necessary. Very interesting debates are now being held here in central Eruope. I have not taken part in them because the answer to the central question that is being discussed -- whether a nuclear war can only be limited to central Europe -- I personally will never know since it will only be answered after I cease to exist.

Therefore, we can only concentrate on one question -- how to prevent war. This cannot be solved militarily. No military means can give us security. In my opinion, this problem can only be solved in one way -- by replacing the policy of nuclear deterrence with the doctrine of common security. [applause] One must understand that one cannot achieve security against one's potential enemy. One can only achieve security with him, together, through joint efforts. [applause]

If a conflict should arise, the FRG would cease to exist, and the GDR would also be destroyed with it. I must say that going to death together, so to speak, was not our intention. [laughter] And so, despite the fact that we have different ideologies and despite the fact that we belong to different alliances, our security can only be common. This is a political idea, and only this idea can serve as a basis for our security -- but never nuclear deterrence. [applause]

[Palme] I would like to ask another question. You were saying that there are 50,000 or 60,000 units of nuclear arms in the world. If we agree to destroy them, a method must be found to do so. Could you give an example of how these mountains of nuclear arms can be destroyed?

[Gayler] Mr Prime Minister, I cannot tell you how pleased I am to hear this question. It so happens that we indeed have a plan of action. It was developed with the assistance of scientists and specialists in politics, among whom is George Kennan. I also took part. The plan consists of the following: The United States and the USSR are to transport the nuclear weapons assigned for destruction to any distant region outside their borders. The nuclear weapons will be studied externally to determine which fissionable materials are present and in what quantities. Under the supervision of representatives of these powers, the fissionable materials are to be extracted from the nuclear weapons and then transformed into fuel for nuclear electric power stations, which will then be shipped back to either power or sold to other countries. The weapons themselves, once again under mutual supervision, are to be cut up into scrap metal. This is a recipe for implementation of any arms reduction agreement. In this way you are ensured of the destruction of weapons under reliable control and the action will be brought to the public's attention. This proposal is technically feasible and economically rational. You may even be able to make money from weapons destruction. It is very practical and easy to control. I think this plan, or a similar one, will allow nuclear arsenals to be destroyed gradually and will make an invaluable contribution to the cause of ensuring security in the world. [applause]

[Arbatov] This idea was put forward by the admiral in a written form. There is also a detailed elaboration of the technical aspects of such a plan proposed by the American professor (Panovskiy). This plan was discussed by American scientists and their Soviet colleagues. The Soviet delegation then was headed by Academician Velikhov who is now present in the hall. This plan was received with interest. If its realization were only up to us then everything would probably be all right. [applause]

I must remind you that there are Soviet Government proposals which envisage ceasing production and gradually reducing nuclear arms right up to their total destruction. If this proposal is accepted by other nuclear powers, that is, is solved on a political level, then the plan will apparently be very useful, because it shows how to solve this problem on a technical level. [applause]

[Palme] I think that this is a wonderful ending to our discussion. The representatives from the United States and the Soviet Union have agreed that the elimination of nuclear arsenals does not present a problem from a technical viewpoint. The problem is the lack of common political efforts to put this into practice, but if such efforts do appear, it would be the most remarkable healing operation in the history of mankind.

I thank the participants in the discussion. I think a great debate has developed in recent years, a kind of nuclear weapons trial. This discussion has greatly influenced public opinion from the intellectual, emotional, and moral viewpoints. Intellectually, it has always been unthinkable to support the use of nuclear weapons, and as the admiral noted, it is also unthinkable to defend the use of these weapons. From a moral viewpoint, what are the people who would make the decision to destroy the existing world worth?

The situation in the world appears to be unfavorable, but the most promising phenomenon is the common sense displayed by various professional groups and ordinary people who have discovered that their own existence, the lives of friends and relatives, and the natural environment are now threatened.

I hope that this is only the beginning of major debates. I hope major debates will follow until we meet at the great event -- the beginning of the elimination of nuclear weapons. [applause]

[Chazov] I want to say that there is no greater task today for physicians than preventive treatment. I am a cardiologist and I am engaged in preventing heart disease. My comrades in our movement are engaged in -- for example -- preventing oncological, nerve, and a whole series of other diseases. But what could be more frightening than the epidemic called nuclear war? That is why preventing nuclear war is one of the most important tasks of our medicine, and not only medicine, not only physicians; this is the task of all honest people in the world and all mankind.

WEST'S NUCLEAR RESEARCH AID TO ISRAEL, RSA CITED

LD101053 Moscow TASS in English 0938 GMT 10 Aug 83

[Text] New Delhi August 10 TASS -- There is irrefutable evidence that the United States, FRG, France, and a number of multinational corporations rendered assistance to Israel and the Republic of South Africa in establishing the basis which helps turn these countries into nuclear powers, writes the newspaper NATIONAL HERALD, close to governmental circles. Most patently manifest was the policy of "double standards", which is conducted by the United States and its allies: Various discriminatory measures are used towards those states, the foreign policy course of which is not to the liking of the West, and meanwhile every assistance and support is given to the regimes which serve Western interests.

It is an open secret, the newspaper stresses, that almost 90 percent of all South African nuclear physicists -- 150 men in all -- underwent training in the United States. Besides, Pretoria received from the United States a big quantity of enriched uranium.

The United States and other Western powers, the newspaper writes in conclusion, are interested to see Israel and the Republic of South Africa become nuclear powers, hoping to use them for exerting pressure upon Arab and African states.

U.S. MILITARY'S WORLDWIDE 'INTERFERENCE' SCORED

LD111726 Moscow TASS in English 1710 GMT 11 Aug 83

[Text] August 11 TASS -- TASS news analyst Vasiliy Kharkov writes:

Large-scale American exercises, code-named "Bright Star-83" which began in the Middle East and East Africa on Wednesday, embrace a huge territory from Oman to Egypt. In each of the four countries where exercises are being held their programme has some specific features, but on the whole these exercises signify obvious demonstration of force. Apart from contingents of U.S. ground troops of almost 10,000 men, involved in the exercises are two American aircraft carriers and about 100 planes, including "B-52" strategic bombers and "F-16" fighter planes. The provocative character of these "military games" is all the more obvious that they are being held at a time of sharp aggravation of tension around Chad and the unbridled anti-Libyan campaign.

Simultaneously with the "Bright Star-83" exercises the Pentagon is preparing a new, no less provocative demonstration of force in Central America.

Reporting preparations for "Big Pine-2" exercises on the territory of Honduras, the American CBS television company reports that many provincial points in Honduras rapidly turn into small parts of America. Camps for American troops are being constructed everywhere. More and more weapons and materiel are arriving from the United States every day.

The build-up of the American military presence which takes place in the Middle East, in Central America, just as in other regions, is evidence of the bellicose militarism of the U.S. Administration, showing that Washington makes stake on military force in its global policy.

The British newspaper DAILY TELEGRAPH cites interesting figures today. 43 percent of the U.S. Armed Forces are now beyond the boundaries of the country. Five American aircraft-carrier squadrons are cruising in the Pacific, Indian, Atlantic Oceans and the Mediterranean Sea.

It should be added that on the territory of other countries the United States deployed more than 1,500 military bases and structures, formed big groupings of armed forces, which are in constant readiness, and keep every ready means for their transfer. The so-called "Rapid Deployment Force", formed by the Pentagon to discharge gendarme functions, became, as one Arab newspaper aptly noted, "the force of rapid interference" into internal affairs of sovereign states.

The flouting of the sovereignty of independent countries, the attempts to dictate to them neocolonialist "norms of conduct", and the desire to exert upon them pressure through power methods were made actually a matter of the state policy of the Washington Administration. This is nothing but a relapse of the former imperialist "gunboat policy". It is exactly such policy which imperils the security and the vital interests of many states, which sharply heightens international tension.

U.S. UNDERGROUND NUCLEAR TEST REPORTED

LD120210 Moscow TASS in English 1909 GMT 11 Aug 83

[Text] Washington August 11 TASS -- Today the United States effected another underground nuclear explosion at the proving ground in Nevada. According to an official spokesman of the U.S. Administration, this is the USA's tenth underground explosion of a nuclear device this year.

LIGHT DIVISIONS TO PLAY 'WORLD GENDARME'

PM111958 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 11 Aug 83 First Edition p 5

[S. Demidov commentary "Following Up a News Report": "Aiming at a Distant Target" -- first paragraph printed in italics]

[Text] Washington, 10 Aug (APN) -- The Pentagon is planning to set up five new infantry divisions capable of conducting combat operations in mountainous regions.

People in Washington are making no secret of the fact that these divisions will be an impressive "makeweight" to the interventionist "Rapid Deployment Forces" which are assigned the functions of gendarme in protecting U.S. "vital interests" in different parts of the globe.

According to THE WASHINGTON POST reports, these combat units will be set up mainly for the purpose of repulsing a mythical "Russian offensive" against the Persian Gulf countries through the mountains of Iran. Furthermore, as the U.S. "brass hats" -- the Pentagon leaders -- declare, the personnel of the new formations can be transported "in case of emergency" to any other part of the world where, in the White House's opinion, "complications" arise for the United States.

This report again demonstrates Washington's desire to follow a policy of "world gendarme." To a no lesser extent it is also evidence of the fact that in order to "justify" the growing U.S. military muscle, people across the ocean resort each time to the false thesis of the nonexistent "Soviet threat."

U.S. CHEMICAL WEAPONS REARMAMENT SLAMMED

PM111947 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 11 Aug 83 First Edition p 3

[P. Akimov article: "United States: 'Chemical Rearmament' and Its Aims"]

[Excerpts] A conference committee of the American Congress has approved the allocation of $130 million to realize the next stage of the $10-billion program for the "chemical rearmament" of the U.S. war machine. This program is a brainchild of the Reagan administration. Emphasizing its significance, the President himself declared that "chemical rearmament is of critical importance to national security."

It certainly was not today that the American leaders conceived their gamble on chemical weapons as an "important" means for carrying out their imperial designs. As much as 60 years ago, expressing his almost reverential attitude toward barbarous weapons, General (Frays), then chief of the U.S. Army's chemical service, wrote: "Let the world know that we will use toxic substances against all armies which fight us and that we propose to use them to the most extreme limits of our art."

At that time the United States had already taken the lead in the sphere of chemical arms. In subsequent decades U.S. militarist circles persistently developed more and more new kinds of chemical weapons and built up stocks of them. They proposed to use these weapons and did use them, "going to the most extreme limits" of cannibalistic "art", as was the case in Korea and Indochina. Reluctant to tie its hands with international agreements banning the use of toxic substances in wars, the United States refused for a long time to ratify the 1925 Geneva Protocol.

Under pressure of world public opinion in 1975 the American leadership was forced to ratify the Geneva Protocol and agree to participate in talks at the Committee on Disarmament on the total prohibition and destruction of chemical weapons.

But as events in subsequent years have shown, the removal of chemical weapons from the arsenals has never entered into the Pentagon's plans. At precisely the time when the U.S. Congress was debating the question of ratifying the Geneva Protocol, a new type of weapon -- chemical ammunition with a binary charge -- was being developed in military chemical laboratories and on U.S. Army ranges. And this weapon was created. In 1977 the 155-mm artillery shell with binary sarin was added to the arsenal. The development of the Bigeye binary chemical bomb and missile warheads with binary VX has now been or is being completed.

What aims, then, was the Pentagon pursuing by creating binary chemical weapons? The American press maintains that the developers of binary chemical weapons were concerned only with safety in producing, storing, and transporting them. However, the American generals' real intentions became clear from the same publications. Thus, it was learned that binary chemical weapons are designed, in particular, for use by U.S. carrier-borne forces. It is dangerous to keep traditional chemical ammunition in the holds of aircraft carriers, but binary ammunition is permissible. By equipping aircraft carriers with binary chemical weapons American strategists are seeking the possibility of preparing for and inflicting chemical strikes very quickly in any part of the globe.

Another aim of creating binary chemical weapons is to secure their deployment in depots on the territory of NATO bloc countries, closer to the socialist community countries' borders. The Pentagon hopes that talk of the "safety" of binary chemical weapons will help to weaken protests against their deployment in West European states.

While creating binary chemical weapons and a plant to manufacture them in the city of Pine Bluff (Arkansas), the Pentagon is at the same time keeping plants for the manufacture of sarin and VX in an operable state. Even plants for the production of yperite, cyanogen chloride, irritant poisons, and chemical defoliants have been preserved. This attests that an extensive program of chemical arms upgrading and not simply "rearmament" is being implemented in the United States.

According to the estimates of foreign specialists, there are now no less than 150,000 metric tons of various toxic substances in the United States. More than 3 million artillery shells and tens of thousands of aerial bombs and missile warheads are filled with them. Thousands of metric tons of toxic substances are being stored in containers with a view to their employment using aerial spraying devices, several thousands of which are stockpiled in the United States. Chemical weapons are stored in 12 arsenals and depots sited on U.S. territory, as well as at depots in the FRG, including right on the border with France.

The United States is continuing the search for new poisons that are increasingly toxic and harmful to people. More than 10 scientific research and testing establishments of the U.S. military department and hundreds of laboratories, universities, and civilian departments are engaged in this research. The United States is developing new types and systems of chemical weapons in collaboration with its NATO allies and also with Israel, the Republic of South Africa, and Taiwan. Expenditures on U.S. research in this sphere have increased tens of times compared with the fifties. Military scientific conferences, Army exercises, and instructional conferences of Army, Air Force, and Navy officials and specialists are devoted to questions of preparing for chemical war.

This confirms very clearly that the most reactionary militarist U.S. circles have adopted a policy of preparing for chemical war. And the U.S. "chemical rearmament" program is one more attempt to achieve military superiority over the Soviet Union.

MARGINAL IMPROVEMENT IN U.S.-SOVIET TIES SEEN

LD121135 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 11 Aug 83

["The World This Week" with Pavel Kuznetsov]

[Text] Things have begun moving in Soviet-American relations. They are not exactly hunky-dory in the absence of vital agreements in the field of arms control, but still they are not as bad as they were yesterday. There are signs of improvement. This is what I understood from recent statements by ranking American officials.

By nature I am a guarded optimist, which means that whenever I here a pessimist say that a glass is half-empty, I say that in my own humble opinion the glass looks half-full. In other words, when I hear people make a statement, I look to see what is in it rather than what is not.

A week ago Secretary of State George Shultz urged relaxation of export controls on oil and gas equipment to the Soviet Union. That is a sign of improvement, according to the New York press. Following this logic, the best way to improve relations with the Soviet Union would be for the United States to slap as many sanctions on us as possible and then gradually relax them. If Aeroflot, the Soviet airline, is again granted landing rights in the United States, would that be heralded as filling the glass of Soviet-American relations to the brim?

Reports from Washington by the NEW YORK (?TIMES) news service abound in suggestions that the decline in Soviet-American relations has stopped. The administration is said to have taken a position between caution and hopefulness. There is a little (?sense) of movement in the peripheral issues. Doors are not completely shut, and so on and so forth. Quoting a senior State Department official, (Hedrick Smith) of THE NEW YORK TIMES said last Monday that they are not making big concessions. By "they" he meant us, the Soviets.

Concessions -- this is the key to understanding the current round of (?guesswork) in Washington concerning Soviet-U.S. relations. Have we Americans pressed hard enough for the Soviets to start making big concessions? Concessions in Geneva on medium-range nuclear arms, concessions in Geneva on strategic weapons, where the American side wants to completely restructure our forces, concessions from the Soviet Union ranging from ideological to major political issues. How about the United States? The Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Policy, Richard Perle, has testified that the administration will go ahead with a few MX missiles, B-1 bombers and Trident submarines, even if an arms reduction agreement is reached with Moscow. In other words, the administration is determined to proceed with the nuclear arms race. Why then all this talk these days about signs of improvement in Soviet-American relations? According to reports from Washington, President Reagan is likely to seek reelection. A healthier climate in Soviet-American relations, even if it be simply mentioned while (?not) being in reality, is one of the winning cards that the administration counts on.

A pessimist would say that the glass of Soviet-American relations is empty. Being a guarded optimist, I would say that there is something in that glass but unfortunately not enough for one good swallow.

U.S. DUPLICITY TOWARD PRC STRATEGIC 'CAMOUFLAGE'

PM111839 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 11 Aug 83 First Edition p 5

["International Notes" by B. Barakhta: "The 'Two Chinas' Policy"]

[Text] According to foreign news agency reports, President Reagan recently allowed China to purchase the latest electronic computers and modern equipment in the so-called "dual-purpose" category, which can be used also for military purposes.

A number of U.S. delegations have visited Beijing. Talks started recently in Washington on the conclusion of Sino-American cooperation agreements in the nuclear energy sphere. A visit by U.S. Defense Secretary C. Weinberger to Beijing and by PRC Foreign Minister Wu Xueqian to Washington are planned for this fall. The question of an exchange of visits by President Reagan and Premier Zhao Ziyang is on the agenda.

Could it be that people in the White House have suddenly found themselves overflowing with sincere feelings of friendship for the People's Republic of China and intend to repudiate their policy which, to put it mildly, contradicts the PRC's national interests? By no means. As the facts prove, U.S. imperialism is only maneuvering and trying to camouflage its two-faced position regarding the PRC. In actual fact, the U.S. Administration has followed and continues to follow in international affairs the so-called "two Chinas" policy which contradicts the aspirations of the Chinese people.

Despite the recent decision, in its trade with the PRC as a whole, Washington follows a discriminatory policy, which has already reflected on the state of bilateral trade. For example, in the first quarter of this year the United States introduced quotas on Chinese textiles, thus restricing the traditional channels of China's exports. The volume of U.S.-Chinese trade fell substantially in the first half of this year in comparison with the same period last year. The U.S. side has presented Beijing with unsubstantiated claims for repayment of imperial China's debts.

Nor is Washington thinking of renouncing its comprehensive support for the "old friends" -- the Taiwan regime. This has been repeatedly declared by the U.S. President and his closest aides.

A law on relations with Taiwan, approved by the Congress, has been in force in the United States since the spring of 1979. Under its provisions Washington guarantees the island's "security," in other words its separation form the PRC, and will continue to render military, financial, material, and political support to the Taiwan regime.

It is typical that on 17 April 1982, the very same day when the joint U.S.-Chinese communique on resolving the question of U.S. arms sales to Taiwan was signed, in a telephone interview with the leading radio and television company, CBS, Reagan openly voiced his attitude to that document: "Absolutely nothing has changed. We will continue to arm Taiwan." Yet last February the U.S. President again emphasized in an interview with U.S. weekly HUMAN EVENTS, as Beijing journal LIAOWANG noted, the fundamental principles of this agreement.

For many years now Washington has been paying dearly for the militaristic preparations of the Taiwan regime. In 1950-1973 the nonrepayable U.S. aid to Taipei amounted to $4.1 billion. This year, according to a recent XINHUA report, the quota for U.S. arms deliveries has reached $800 million. A few days ago, according to THE WASHINGTON POST, the Reagan administration informed Congress of its intention of shipping to the island yet another consignment of arms amounting to $530 million counting toward this quota.

It is also typical that Japan is becoming more and more actively involved in the large-scale U.S. military preparations in the Pacific. The consolidation of the Washington-Tokyo military axis, to which Seoul is attached, is a factor which seriously destabilizes the situation in East Asia and creates tension near the borders of the PRC, the Soviet Union, and other states in the region.

Under these conditions, many observers voice the opinion that the Reagan administration's decision to grant China the status of "friendly nonallied state" in trade is mainly dictated by the strategic interests of U.S. imperialism.

U.S. TAIWAN POLICY DISREGARDS PRC INTERESTS

OW111213 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Mandarin to China 1430 GMT 10 Aug 83

[Glebov commentary: "Washington Has Stubbornly Carried Out Its Line"]

[Text] Both China and the United States have recently indicated that their bilateral relations have been improved somewhat. This can be evidenced by the fact that the United States made some concession in reaching an agreement on Chinese textile exports to the United States. Both sides optimistically view Chinese Foreign Minister Wu Xueqian's visit to the United States sometime in September or October and Pentagon chief Weinberger's forthcoming visit to Beijing. However, the key indicator of Sino-U.S. relations is the Taiwan issue. The Chinese press has always emphatically mentioned this point. What should be pointed out is that the U.S. imperialists, with regard to this issue, always stubbornly pursue their own line as they did in the past and totally disregard the national interest of China and the Chinese people. Moreover, the current U.S. Administration hardens this line even further.

President Reagan delivered some strongly worded speeches during his election campaign. For example, in August 1980, he even advocated restoration of formal relations with the Taiwan clique. It was after he was elected that Reagan started to ponder the real situation and softened his tone somewhat. Nevertheless, he has not changed his policy towards the Taiwan issue. U.S. ties with Taipei in various aspects have been continuously expanded and strengthened. It is reported that a U.S. Congressional delegation, during its visit to Taiwan, received a warm reception by the Taipei upper ruling clique. Various delegations from Taiwan also visited the United States.

Trade between the United States and Taiwan is very active. Last month, the U.S. representative in Taipei pointed out that economic relations between the United States and Taiwan have been strengthened continuously. In fact, their economic ties have always been very close. In 1982, Taiwan ranked seventh among all U.S.-Asian trading partners and the trade volume was approximately U.S. $13.5 billion, while trade volume between the United States and China only accounted for half that figure.

The most important thing is that the U.S. imperialists are continuing to arm Taiwan's Kuo Ming Tang regime. This has violated all Sino-U.S. communiques and the solemn verbal guarantee given by the U.S. Administration on reducing and terminating military aid to Taiwan. At a news conference held at the end of February this year, President Reagan quite clearly set the U.S. policy towards the issue of arms supply to Taiwan. He said: We will provide them with the things agreed on by both sides. Their representatives have come to the United States to explain their military needs at the conference table. Besides, the Taiwan Relations Act also contains some provisions in this aspect. We will continue to satisfy their needs in the future and discuss how to do it in accordance with the situation in that area.

Based on this line, the Reagan administration has recently announced that it will provide U.S. $530 million worth of arms to the Chiang clique. The spokesman for the Taiwan authorities has indicated that they are pleased with this decision and the United States has very sincerely implemented the Taiwan Relations Act.

According to a NEW YORK TIMES report, the White House has made another decision on providing U.S. $780 million worth of arms to Taiwan next year. This also has made members of the Chiang gang very happy. At present, the U.S. imperialists are carrying out a more reckless policy of aggression. Obviously, they do not want to lose Taiwan. They still treat Taiwan as their unsinkable aircraft carrier. Taiwan is an inherent part of China, but it is being controlled by the United States. This is a problem involving China's sovereignty and territorial integrity.

NEW TIMES EXPOSES PRC PRESS DISTORTIONS ON DRA

LD212242 Moscow World Service in English 2000 GMT 21 Jul 83

[Text] The Moscow weekly NEW TIMES has exposed Chinese press reports distorting events in Afghanistan and around it. The weekly draws attention to the fact that some reports were published last month at a time when a round of Afghan-Pakistani talks was held in Geneva. Chinese papers claim that the peaceful efforts to normalize the situation around Afghanistan were hopeless, the Government of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan was described as unlawful and the Afghan counterrevolutionaries were extolled for their sham military and political success. They referred to the counterrevolutionaries whom the American Secretary of State, George Shultz, in a recent visit to Pakistan promised firm and permanent American support.

NEW TIMES notes that the greater success the Afghan people make, the more the United States whips up its slanderous campaign against Afghanistan. Whatever the Afghan Government has been doing it aimed at normalizing the situation in Afghanistan and around it. This puts on edge the ruling quarters in the United States.
The question is why Washington's inventions are echoed by Chinese authors when they assess the events in Afghanistan. Have authors in China forgotten that imperialist news media doesn't hesitate to make up falsehoods? China knows from its own experience that the imperialist quarters don't disdain to use any means to smear the revolutionary gains of peoples, justify interference in other countries' affairs or fuel differences between nations. They don't scruple to do this to ease action on imperial claims that always go hand in hand with various fantasies about the policy of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries.

No one is surprised to hear Ronald Reagan, the president who announced a crusade against socialism, slander the situation in Afghanistan or distort Soviet policy, but it is strange indeed that some Chinese authors repeat word by word the inventions of the American media. It is hard to believe, notes the Moscow weekly, that they are in ignorance of the Soviet Union's position. Soviet leaders have said time and again that their country has never sought any privileges in Afghanistan to the detriment of neighbors. The heart of the matter is not the limited troops contingent that the Soviet Union sent to Afghanistan at the request of the sovereign government. What matters is foreign intervention.

The Soviet Union does not intend to leave its troop contingent in Afghanistan for good or to threaten third countries from Afghan territory. It has said as much, more than once. Chinese authors cannot but know too that Soviet soldiers will leave Afghanistan as soon as there is no more aggression against that country and there are reliable guarantees that the aggression will not be resumed. The NEW TIMES notes that the Soviet Union is keenly interested in settling the crisis-prone situation on its southern borders politically and at an early date. For that reason it supports the Afghani-Pakistani talks held with the mediation of the representative from the United National secretary general.

The reports circulated by Chinese papers with their absurdities concerning the Afghan events are not promoting by a single inch the cause of political settlement. On the contrary, they are only fuelling the tensions caused by foreign interference. The Moscow weekly NEW TIMES concludes by saying that this plays into the hands of American imperialism.

JAPAN BUDGETS FOR F-16 DEPLOYMENT AT MISAWA

OW111447 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1200 GMT 10 Aug 83

[Tokyo correspondent Vykhukhalev report]

[Text] The Japanese Government is making every possible effort to get ready for the deployment of American F-16 fighter-bombers at the Misawa base to start in 1985 as scheduled. In this connection, Radio Moscow's Tokyo correspondent Vykhukhalev has filed the following report:

The Japanese press reports that a representative of the Defense Agency stated at a 9 August session of the Standing Committee for the cabinet of the House of Councillors that the government plans to appropriate funds in 1984 for the construction of 250 housing units for American officers, servicemen, and their dependents as well as for 2 to 4 dormitories for the ground crew at the Misawa base. According to ASAHI SHIMBUN calculations, approximately 7.5 billion yen has been requested for the 250 housing units at the Misawa base alone. The Defense Agency will include this amount in its draft budget for the next fiscal year.

It stands to reason that the Defense Agency believes that the Ministry of Finance and the cabinet will not reduce the funds for the Misawa base projects. Should the funds be reduced, Director General Tanikawa of the Defense Agency would be severely criticized at the talks with Secretary of Defense Weinberger in Washington on 22 August for not volunteering to share the so-called large burden. Prime Minister Nakasone would encounter the same criticism at the talks with President Reagan who is scheduled to visit Japan in November.

In this connection, the planned appropriation of funds for the Misawa base projects should be viewed as a great concession of the Japanese side to the United States in preparation for the coming talks between the two countries. However, this will cause a major problem.

According to calculations made by Japanese papers, the expenditures for the deployment of 48 F-16 fighter-bombers will certainly overstep the limit on defense spending, which, the Japanese Government states, should not exceed 1 percent of the GNP. And this will signify a change in the nature of Japan's military policy and quicken the pace of turning Japan into a military superpower, which constitutes a menace to its neighboring countries.

Aside from the figures, the deployment at Misawa base of American F-16 fighter-bombers capable of carrying nuclear weapons will pose a great danger to peace in this region, including Japan, since Japan is involved in promoting this deployment by sharing the bulk of the expenditures.

It goes without saying that the decision on whether or not to load F-16's, which are capable of reaching Soviet territory from the Misawa base, with nuclear bombs will be made not by the Japanese Government but by Washington. In either case , it will be impossible for the Soviet Union not to give the F-16 deployment in Japan a serious consideration. The Japanese Government believes that questions concerning medium-range nuclear weapons should be solved on a so-called global basis. In this connection, the Japanese Government needs to once again make a cautious study of what results the United States expects to achieve by deploying F-16's in Japan.

JAPAN TO TRANSFER 'MILITARY TECHNOLOGY' TO U.S.

LD120849 Moscow TASS in English 0738 GMT 12 Aug 83

[Text] Tokyo August 12 TASS -- Three leading Japanese ministries, responsible for military and economic policy, have coordinated the terms of the transfer of advanced technology to the United States.

The newspaper JAPAN TIMES reports today that this decision will give the Pentagon free access to Japanese electronics, laser and optical equipment necessary to implement the arms buildup programme.

The Foreign Trade and Industry Ministry, the Foreign Ministry and the Defence Agency plan to conduct an exchange of military technology with the United States on a long-term and large-scale basis. The decision was adopted under strong pressure from the Defence Agency which insisted that the American demands be met as soon as possible despite Japan's official ban on arms export endorsed by a parliamentary resolution, JAPAN TIMES writes. Tokyo decided to ignore the ban, proclaiming that the military technology transfer to the United States does not exceed the framework of the Japanese-American "security treaty".

USSR-DPRK SIGN TRADE PACT; TRADE DOUBLED IN 82

SK120114 Moscow in Korean to Korea 0930 GMT 11 Aug 83

[News report from feature program on Primorskiy Kray]

[Excerpt] An (?agreement) was signed between the Soviet (Dawindorg) Trading Corporation and the DPRK Foreign Trading Corporation. Through the border trade, the Soviet Union will export household machines, construction materials, and chemical products and the DPRK will export fresh and canned vegetables, fruits, and textile products.

The border trade volume between the Soviet Union and the DPRK doubled last year.

USTASHI SUBVERT YUGOSLAVIA WITH FOREIGN HELP

PM121040 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 31 Jul 83 Morning Edition p 4

[Own correspondent V. Ardatovskiy dispatch: "The Master the Ustashi Serve Today"]

[Text] Belgrade -- The trial of an underground group of antisocialist conspirators ended recently in Zagreb. They had blown up a power line pylon and were preparing other acts of sabotage. The gang was connected with foreign Ustashi centers.

Stained with the blood of Yugoslav patriots and service to fascism during the people's liberation struggle, the Ustashi remain socialist Yugoslavia's most vicious enemies. They do not balk at any methods -- from attempts on the lives of Yugoslav representatives to compromising Yugoslav tourism.

The chief centers of the Ustashi are the "Croatian National Council," with headquarters in Stuttgart, the "Croatian National Congress" (New York), the "Croatian Information Center" (London), and the "Revolutionary Croatian Brotherhood" operating in Australia. Many other groupings also exist, falling out among themselves over the handouts from Western intelligence and propaganda services. The subversive organizations are particularly active wherever there are Yugoslavs who have gone abroad to work. This is the milieu in which hardened fascists from World War II try to recruit the next generation and reinforcements.

The Australian Ustashi are led by war criminal -- (Srechko Rover). He prepares his lackeys for future overt actions, training them on the firing range. On one of these training grounds in Victoria state the Ustashi have trained with neo-nazis from West European countries. "The leaders of the Australian Ustashi," a Melbourne newspaper wrote recently, "who include 30 war criminals, glorify monsters such as (Pavelieh), (Artukovich), and (Luburich) in their publications. This is incompatible with our country's democratic traditions."

It is indeed incompatible. But, as the Belgrade newspaper BORBA noted, the Ustashi's activity in Australia is "concealed behind anticommunist slogans and has the approval and even support of certain circles of Australian society, including its upper crust."

Reagan's arguments about communism as an evil which must be annihilated and the attempts to organize a crusade against communism have revived the activity of the enemies of socialist Yugoslavia too. The Ustashi emigres are the largest but not the only force among them. The trial of quite a large underground gang which operated with the frenzy of Muslim fanaticism is currently under way in Sarajevo, the capital of the Socialist Republic of Bosnia and Hercegovina. Among this group's ringleaders are the former participants in the "Young Muslims" organization, which was smashed in the first postwar years. The accused made it their task to undermine the socialist system in Bosnia and Hercegovina. In their malicious blindness they were counting on a third world war....

SFRY working people justifiably rebuff the intrigues of the sworn enemies of socialist Yugoslavia and of the fraternity and unity of its peoples.

ITALIAN ECONOMY BENEFITS FROM SOVIET TRADE

PM111142 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 10 Aug 83 Morning Edition p 5

[Own correspondent report under the rubric "Business Contacts": "Milan: Mutually Advantegous"]

[Excerpt] Milan -- Every time I come to Milan I see the business people's commitment to developing Italian-Soviet economic relations. Unlike certain politicians who act with one eye on Washington, they view things soberly and chiefly on the basis of their own interests. And these interests prompt them to extend and deepen ties with our country. This is particularly important in the conditions of the recession which had struck not only Italy, but all the developed capitalist countries and has substantially narrowed the foreign market for Italian industry. Soviet orders are regarded here as a factor of some importance in maintaining business activity. Italian industrialists show great interest in Soviet 5-year plans and other economic development programs. This interest is far from academic. They examine our economic documents from the viewpoint of participation by their enterprises in implementing them.

In Italian business circles there is growing concern over the continuing U.S. attempts to involve Italy and the other Common Market countries in economic warfare against the Soviet Union. Representatives of the business world make no secret of their negative attitude to all kinds of attempts to retard artificially the development of Italian-Soviet economic relations. In the newspaper LA REPUBBLICA the prominent economist Rinaldo Ossola, president of the Italian-Soviet chamber of trade, called for the further development of economic cooperation between Italy and the USSR.

On my return from Milan to Rome, I interviewed L.S. Yezhov, the Soviet Union's trade representative it Italy. "Economic relations between our two countries" he said, "have an ancient and -- what is particularly gratifying -- a good tradition. In the sixties and seventies they received great impetus as a result of the conclusion of major gas and oil agreements, as well as cooperation in the construction of the Volga truck plant. A number of chemical enterprises have been built in the Soviet Union with participation by Italian firms. In 1983 Italy took third place in the Soviet Union's trade turnover with developed capitalist countries."

As for the Soviet side, we are prepared to further deepen mutually advantageous Soviet-Italian economic ties.

NEW ITALIAN GOVERNMENT RERUN OF FORMER ONE

LD112111 Moscow in Italian to Italy 1700 GMT 11 Aug 83

[Text] The new Italian Government led by Socialist Bettino Craxi has presented its program in parliament. Our observer Mikhail Dobrov writes in this connection:

The fact that for the first time the Italian Government is headed by a socialist is presented by certain people as an historical event. That the government is really formed by a representative of the Socialist Party gives one at first glance reason to expect new elements in the choice of politics. But this is only at first glance. The truth is that the new five-party government is in substance the creature of the same government coalition whose inefficiencies led to the fall of the previous government and to the dissolution of parliament. The parliamentary elections, moreover, have brought no radical change in the broad outlines of the balance of forces and the political arena although the Christian Democratic Party suffered a setback.

Under the circumstances the Christian Democratic leadership was able to cede to the socialists the position of prime minister which for some time was coveted by Bettino Craxi. The Christian Democratic Party acted on the assumption that the Socialists were not in fact inexpert in matters of power and that they had shown themselves, especially these last few years, worth representatives of the interests of the ruling circles, capable of ensuring the continuity of a policy advantageous to those circles.

LA REPUBBLICA described the deal between the Christian Democrats and the Socialist Party as an operation whereby which Craxi would lead the new cabinet while the Christian Democrats reduced to a minimum the consequences of their electoral defeat. One should also add that they succeeded not only in minimizing the consequences of their own defeat also in imposing on the new prime minister their hard line in the economic field.

The Christian Democrats have powerful levers. They now have more ministerial posts than the other four parties of the government coalition put together. The revived post of deputy prime minister also belongs to a Christian Democrat now.

The new government program presented to parliament shows that in substance the line of its predecessors will be continued. The measures in the economic field boil down to a regime of austerity quite frankly at the expense of the worker. Thus among the government plans to overcome the crisis there is the social pact within whose framework the trade unions must limit their wage claims. To remedy the serious ills of the Italian economy, that is to say, to reduce inflation and the deficit in the balance of trade, the old recipe is proposed in practice, a recipe that is extremely unpopular among Italians, that is to say, cutting social extenses.

Continuity is present to an even greater extent in the foreign policy drawn up by the new government. It was announced in Rome that it intends to continue to implement the decision on the installation of new American nuclear weapons on Italian territory in spite of the protests of vast sections of the population. It is not by chance that Washington hastened to express satisfaction with the appointment of the leader of the Socialists. Washington also expressed the hope that relations between the United States and Italy would continue to be excellent.

Observers are unanimous in the opinion that the new government, by inheriting from the previous government a country affected by a deep crisis, will have to deal with many difficulties. The attempts to overcome these difficulties with old methods are doomed to failure. This point was stressed, among others, by the Communists, who stated their opposition to the new edition of the government of the preceding majority albeit led by a Socialist.

SOVIET ICELANDIC-OFFICIALS DISCUSS DISARMAMENT

PM112005 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 11 Aug 83 Morning Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Consultations Held"]

[Text] Reykjavik, 10 Aug -- Soviet-Icelandic consultations have been held at the Icelandic Foreign Ministry on questions of arms limitations and other urgent international problems which will be discussed at the 38th UN General Assembly Session. Participating in them were V.F. Petrovskiy, member of the USSR Foreign Ministry Collegium; M.N. Streltsov, USSR ambassador to Iceland; I. Ingvarsson, general secretary of the Icelandic Foreign Ministry, and his deputy O. Egilsson.

V.F. Petrovskiy and M.N. Streltsov were received by G. Hallgrimsson, Iceland's foreign minister.

IRAN'S 'ALI KHAMENE'I REMARKS ON USSR ASSAILED

GF111350 Moscow in Persian to Iran 1700 GMT 10 Aug 83

[Igor Sheftunov commentary]

[Excerpts] Dear listeners, peace be upon you. President 'Ali Khamene'i during prayers last Friday in Tehran used this forum to comment on conditions in socialist countries and the Soviet Union. In his speech he alleged that in socialist countries, people have been removed from all participation in every government institution and that the governments in these countries are not popular governments.

It is obvious why 'Ali Khamene'i made these claims but did not name any institution because such institutions do not exist, and the facts refute his allegations.

Our people are not only ruling the country and have all the power in their hands but they also own all factories, mines and all other means of production. This system ensures that in the Soviet Union exploiters do not exist nor can they occupy high positions in the government. This lack of opportunity for such exploiters raises the ire of the capitalist systems against the Soviet Union.

If Mr 'Ali Khamene'i had really meant what he said he would have specifically named those bodies lacking popular support for the benefit of the Friday prayers congregation.

Today in the capitalist countries the key positions, the means of production and wealth are in the hands of a handful of exploiters. Also in these countries the real power is in the hands of the oppressors and the workers have no say in anything.

One can easily understand why President 'Ali Khamene'i used the Friday prayers for slinging mud at socialist countries in which the control of government really lies in the hands of the people. The facts are that inside Iran big capitalists and big landowners and other exploiters are fast gaining power. One might as well mention here that today 80 percent of all land in Iran is controlled by the big landowners. The income of the capitalists and the arrogant few is increasing yearly. According to information published by the Majlis the big merchants in Iran pocket $16 billion in interest every year. Although the new Iranian constitution has clauses discouraging exploitation, in practice reality is quite opposite. The capitalists and [word indistinct], by using certain groups in the guards and the clerics and their agents within the Majlis, ministries and other organs are increasing their strength and control in the state. They want, as much as possible, for the Iranian working class and the workers to be ousted from the government. They ignore the rights of these people. This is why the Iranian Tudeh Party has been subjected to reprisals and propaganda today. This is the party which in fact defended the rights of the working classes in the country and struggled to end Western exploitation in Iran and for Iranian workers to gain control of the government.

In brief, the capitalists and big landowners in Iran, under the guise of talk about the "third way," and a "neither East nor West" policy are preparing to establish a total anti-people dictatorship. The statement by President 'Ali Khamene'i at the recent Friday prayers in Tehran [words indistinct]. President 'Ali Khamene'i (?avoided) mentioning capitalist countries where the exploiters rule and he attacked the socialist countries where the government is really in the hands of the people.

'Ali Khamene'i also tried to malign Soviet foreign policy.

U.S. POLICY IN CHAD 'THREAT' TO ALL AFRICANS

PM111336 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 11 Aug 83 First Edition p 5

[Sergey Filatov "Observer's Opinion"]

[Text] The imperialist intervention in Chad's internal affairs has entered a new stage: It has been announced that French paratroops are being transferred to Ndjamena. Thus the situation in this African country is becoming more and more acute: It has become the target for direct interference by NATO member states.

The United States, as the foreign press reports, exerted strong pressure on France, demanding that the latter be the first to begin the intervention. And under this pressure the French Government decided to transfer its "commandos" to Ndjamena -- something that immediately caused satisfaction in Washington. It is obvious that, by pushing France into interference, the United States is pursuing mainly its own military-strategic goals. The Reagan administration intends to exploit this conflict, fanned with ill intent, to step up its presence on the African Continent and is now attempting, in particular, to realize its aggressive schemes against Libya, which stands on anti-imperialist positions.

The further escalation of the conflict is clear evidence of the striving by imperialist circles to restore their shaken influence in Africa. These plans extend over a vast territory and essentially present a threat to all African peoples. Judging by reports from the African capitals, people there are clearly aware of how far this imperialist interference has progressed and what a threat it is to the liberated countries, and demand that it be ended immediately. This demand is completely justified because it corresponds with the interests of peace on the African Continent.

USSR PARTY, STATE DELEGATION DEPARTS FOR CONGO

LD112221 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 2005 GMT 11 Aug 83

[Text] A Soviet party and government delegation headed by Kalin, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee and deputy chairman of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet; Koshelev, deputy chairman of the USSR State Committee for Foreign Economic Relations; Pankov, rector of the Social Sciences Institute of the CPSU Central Committee; and (Kirendyasov), a senior functionary of the CPSU Central Committee's International Department, departed on 11 August for the People's Republic of the Congo to take part in the celebrations of the 20th anniversary of the Congolese revolution.

RSFSR PAPER HITS U.S. 'MILITARISM' IN C. AMERICA

PM111914 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 11 Aug 83 First Edition p 1

[Vladimir Travkin: "International Review": "Washington's Military Blackmail"]

[Text] The situation in Central America continues to worsen. With the aim of restoring full U.S. control in this zone, which is in the grip of the peoples' liberation struggle, the Reagan administration is pursuing a strong-arm policy there aimed at overthrowing the Sandinist government in Nicaragua and at protecting the corrupt El Salvador regime which is waging a war for the destruction of its own people. The White House boss is carrying out one of his main foreign policy goals -- that of restoring the whole world's "faith in American determination" by proceeding from the fallacious idea that this can only be achieved by rejecting compromise in situations where America's military and economic might can prove decisive.

The largest U.S. naval flotilla that has ever been assembled in this zone has been sent to the coast of Nicaragua. Some 19 warships, divided into three groups, are taking part in maneuvers in the waters of the Caribbean and the Pacific in the Central American region. The crews of those vessels, including those of two aircraft carriers, number more than 16,000 men. To that number must be added about 10,000 U.S. officers and men who will be participating in joint maneuvers in Honduras. These maneuvers will last at least 6 months which means, in fact, a permanent presence of U.S. troops near Nicaragua's borders. In Honduras the Americans are modernizing military airfields and building ports near tracking stations for which nearly $150 million has been allocated. A large quantity of military hardware and weapons is being shipped into the country. Honduras is being turned into a U.S. military base -- a base for an invasion which is already being carried out. At the moment it is being carried out by Somozist remnants trained and armed on Honduran territory by U.S. instructors and with U.S. money. The Somozist gangs, whose raids on Nicaraguan territory are being carried out with Honduran Army support, already number over 10,000 men. It is well-known that there are plans to increase that number to 15,000-16,000. Salvadoran goons are also being trained in Honduras.

At the same time, Washington is striving to isolate Nicaragua and the Salvadoran patriots from the other Latin American countries so as to get the OAS to adopt collective measures with regard to Nicaragua. That is the aim of the "political peace initiatives" of the United States and its Central American allies by which they are attempting to equalize the situation in El Salvador and Nicaragua. The brigandage by the Somozist murderers and oppressors is being presented as a "civil war fought by a population discontented with the Sandinist authorities."

A fierce propaganda campaign -- a real psychological war whose main weapon is fear -- is being conducted to discredit the Nicaraguan revolution. Nicaragua's neighbors are being intimidated by the depiction of Nicaragua as an "aggressive state with a constantly growing army". The ordinary American is being intimidated by the "communist infiltration of Central America" which, it is alleged, threatens the security of the United States itself. The "average American," depressed by the unemployment that is increasing as a result of Reagan's economic policy and by the financial upheavals, is being constantly fed the idea that "if Central America falls, Americans will have to face an invasion of their country by 10 million, 16 million, or 20 million refugees who speak no English and who will be demanding work." The United States is intimidating its West European NATO partners by saying that, in the event of conflict on a worldwide scale, instability in Central America and the Caribbean, where important communications and routes for the supply of Western Europe with U.S. military materials and fuel run, could have an adverse effect on America's ability to fulfill its alliance duty "in the face of a Soviet military threat."

The main task of all these propagandist and diplomatic efforts is to prove that the real reason for the unrest in Central America is not hunger, poverty, illiteracy, and other socioeconomic ills, but a global confrontation caused by an offensive by forces of "the aggressive East" against the "West which is defending itself." In this respect, active use is being made of the myth of Cuban interference in the affairs of the region's countries.

In attempting to hide its true aims in Central America the Reagan administration is making every effort to demonstrate its readiness to resolve the conflicts by political means and talks. Richard Stone, recently appointed the U.S. President's special envoy, has visited a number of Latin American countries, has been to Nicaragua, and has even met with representatives of the Salvadoran patriots. Latin America has rightly assessed the latter as U.S. recognition of the Salvadoran revolutionary organizations' real political strength. At the same time the continent is expressing fears that this move is purely propagandist in character, just like the recent speech to a U.S. Senate commission by Secretary of State Shultz. The head of the U.S. diplomatic department was trying to pacify the anxious American public and the opposition on Capitol Hill by diverting their attention from the U.S. military preparations in Central America by means of arguments to the effect that the main element of Reagan's policy is America's "generous efforts" aimed at the economic development of the countries of the region. Shultz acknowledged that $610 million has been allocated for these aims in the current fiscal year.

Representatives of the Washington Administration are also constantly speaking about their support for the "Contadora Group's" initiatives aimed at seeking peaceful solutions to the conflicts in Central America. But in actual fact, the White House, which is operating via its puppets -- Central America's dictators -- and which is also exerting constantly growing financial, political, and diplomatic pressure on the countries of the above-mentioned group, is trying to split them and nullify all the positive elements of their efforts. A special place in these plans is assigned to Mexico -- the most consistent "Contadora" member. According to a report in the newspaper EXCELSIOR, strong pressure will be exerted on Mexico during the 14 August meeting between Ronald Reagan and Mexican President Miguel de la Madrid. It is planned to use a whole package of measures as the means of exerting this pressure -- ranging from an intensification of the persecution of Mexican workers in the United States to the ending of U.S. assistance in Mexico's fulfillment of its commitments to the IMF.

Recent events in Guatemala also indicate Washington's actual intentions. To most observers the military coup in that country which borders on Mexico was no surprise. General Rios Montt, who was overthrown a few days ago and who seized power last spring "on the personal instructions of the Lord God," as he put it, disappointed the hopes of his earthly protectors. He failed to resolve the country's economic problems, to establish relations even with the right-wing political parties, to reach an agreement with the Catholic Church or -- and this is the main thing -- to suppress the guerrilla movement in the country. All this prevented the Guatemalan regime from actively participating in the implementation of America's military plans in Central America. But the Pentagon's scheme consisted specifically in using the Guatemalan reaction against the progressive forces in Honduras, El Salvador, and Guatemala. The wish has long been to form these countries into a militarist bloc which the Latin American press has called the "iron triangle." By all accounts, Brigadier General Oscar Humberto Mejia, the new dictator -- a rabid anticommunist and goon -- seems to Washington a more capable performer. On the eve of the coup he had a meeting with his colleagues -- General Gustavo Alvarez Martinez, the Honduran minister of defense, and General Carlos Vides Casanova, the Salvadoran minister of defense and public security -- on board the U.S. aircraft carrier "Ranger" which is patrolling the coasts of Nicaragua. Vides Casanova took office recently, also on the Pentagon's recommendation.

Nor can there be any doubt of Alvarez Martinez's "efficiency" -- it was he who turned Honduras into a bridge head for U.S. aggression. It seems that, in the eyes of the U.S. military, all three sides of the "iron triangle" are now firm.

To complete the picture it should be added that cooperation has recently been galvanized between the United States and Israel in the matter of fueling military tension in Central America. Tel Aviv has long been supplying weapons to the Central American "gorillas." Both Somoza and Rios Montt received them. Now Honduras is receiving Israeli artillery pieces, mortar shells, conventional mines, hand grenades, and ammunition. They are intended for the Somozists and are being sent by Tel Aviv on Washington's instructions. Thereby Israel has been turned from an "independent supplier" of arms into America's direct agent in the region. Officers of Pinochet's army and from some NATO countries have also been noticed in Honduras near the Nicaraguan border. U.S. imperialism intends to embroil as many allies as possible in its military adventure in the region. Not for nothing are they talking on Capitol Hill about Reagan's "Thatcher syndrome" -- he would very much like to "win a war somewhere." The example set by Britain's "Iron Lady," who was reelected for a new term on a wave of chauvinist fervor caused by the military expedition to the Falkland (Malvinas) Islands, is very appealing to Ronald Reagan, who is again entering the election struggle.

The people and government of revolutionary Nicaragua are countering America's military blackmail with a calm and balanced policy aimed at preserving peace in Central America. The world public positively assessed the Sandinist leadership's constructive proposals put forward during the celebration of the fourth anniversary of the revolution's victory. The cause of peace is also served by Cuba's position which has been set out in recent statements by Fidel Castro.

The Reagan administration's militarist course, which reflects his general line of worsening the situation in the world, is causing indignation among the peace-loving and democratic international public. Throughout the world a campaign of solidarity has been launched with the Nicaraguan, Salvadoran, and Guatemalan peoples' heroic struggle for their independence.

ECUADORAN AMBASSADOR STRESSES PEACE, SOVIET TIES

LD102106 Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian 1300 GMT 10 Aug 83

[From the Vremya newscast: Statement by Juan Carlos Faidutti, ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary of the Republic of Ecuador to the USSR, on the occasion of Ecuador's national holiday; date and place of statement not given]

[Excerpts] Since 1945 our country has maintained diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union, and the foreign policies of our two countries coincide on many issues. Ecuador's foreign policy is guided by the principles proclaimed in the charters of the UN and the OAS. It advocates respect for national sovereignty, noninterference in the internal affairs of states, renunciation of the threat of force and its application, self-determination of peoples, and ideological pluralism -- which means maintaining relations with states regardless of their political and socioeconomic system, provided they follow a foreign policy of peace and peaceful coexistence.

Relations between Ecuador and the Soviet Union in the economic, technical, cultural, sporting, and other fields are expanding and becoming stronger every day. There are still sufficient fields in which our cooperation can be developed, and I have no doubt that these relations will continue to develop successfully in the future thanks to both sides' sincere aspirations. Good relations between peoples is a reliable guarantee of peace and must become the norm -- the coexistence of peoples.

MVD'S FEDORCHUK ON LAW AND ORDER MEASURES

PM111119 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 10 Aug 83 First Edition p 3

[Article by V. Fedorchuk, USSR Minister of Internal Affairs, under the rubric "The Citizen, Society and the Law": "Guarding Law and Order"]

[Text] The CPSU Central Committee June (1983) Plenum presented the party's policy tasks for further improving developed socialism and molding the new man. Comrade Yu.V. Andropov's speech noted that the "normal course of our social development is inconceivable without the strictest observance of the laws that protect society's interests and the citizen's rights." The measures taken to step up the struggle against violations of labor, state, and social discipline, to strengthen order and organization, and to increase each worker's sense of responsibility for his allotted task have received full approval and nationwide support.

The education of the new man is closely linked with overcoming such antisocial phenomena as drunkenness, hooliganism, parasitism, speculation, and embezzlement of socialist property. The eradication of criminality and of the factors that engender it is an urgent task. It is being resolved by the joint efforts of party and soviet organs, trade unions and the Komsomol, law enforcement organs, labor collectives, and the public at large.

Special responsibility rests on the Soviet militia. It is called upon to ensure as efficiently as possible that public order is protected and that violations of the law are prevented, and to strive to ensure that each crime is investigated as necessary and that the culprits are duly punished. It is the militia's lofty official duty to wage a skillful, professionally well-trained and aggressive struggle against violations of the law. And most militiamen are fulfilling that duty honorably.

To safeguard public order the militia's patrol and point duty service has been considerably stepped up. Personnel have been drafted into patrol work as much as possible and the number of duty details, particularly night duty, has increased.

The militia divisional inspector section has been considerably expanded and its role is to be increased. It forms the largest detachment of militia officers which is closest to the population and in the forefront of the struggle for sound public order. The population must know its divisional inspector well and must always be able to locate him whenever necessary. And it is incumbent on him, in turn, to rely capably on the active public and to know the situation in his division and its "trouble" spots, metaphorically speaking, so as to exert timely influence on, for example, a drunken brawler in an apartment, a slacker who is avoiding work or, in emergencies, to promptly and swiftly use the rights granted him by law. It is important that the divisional inspector actively carry out his immediate duties in protecting law and order.

He has quite a few concerns of his own. After all, it is well known that in everyday life drunkenness often gives rise to murders, physical injuries, or malicious hooliganism. The criminal investigations department and the divisional militia have been set the task of comprehensively stepping up preventive and surveillance work while at the same time showing professional tact and attaching priority to persuasion and warning. However, preventive work must not be reduced to giving warnings to those against whom strict measures should have been taken long before. Militia preventive work should not be purely admonitory or formal, but practical, flexible, efficient and capable not only of preventing crime but also of eliminating the causes of crime, which is the main thing.

Drunkenness, which poisons people's health and their attitude to everyday life and production, remains a great social evil. Nearly 50 percent of crimes and 80 percent of the manifestation of hooliganism are committed because of drunkenness. In the struggle against this evil, it is necessary to increase the joint coordinated efforts of the militia and of labor collectives by using social, economic, medical and legal preventive measures in the early stages of the fatal passion for alcohol. More widespread use should be made of labor and medical treatment at drug abuse centers and in-patient departments at production units themselves. Good results are being achieved, for example, at enterprises in Moscow Oblast and in Sverdlovsk, Irkutsk and many other cities.

The militia, for its part, does not intend to tolerate drunkards, and will make increasingly resolute use of administrative sanctions in those cases where they are provided for by the law--in particular, the compulsory treatment of alcoholics in preventing clinics--and will strive to ensure that leaders of enterprises and institutions take action on each report of drunkenness. It must be acknowledged that, to date, the administrations and social organizations of a number of collectives respond only formally to militia reports of this kind.

Drunkenness engenders hooliganism and parasitism. One crime in five is committed by those not at work and it is precisely these who exert a corrupting influence on young people by their parasitic way of life. In letters to newspaper editorial offices and to the USSR MVD, citizens suggest that greater demands be placed on those who do not work for society's good. Such measures are being taken everywhere. In Leningrad, for example, groups of soviet deputies, public order protection centers, people's volunteer militia and enterprise cadre sections are participating actively in this work. The supervision and monitoring of the timeliness of official warnings to and the finding of employment for parasites have been stepped up. All this makes it possible to strengthen public order and production discipline. The Law on Labor Collectives adopted by the USSR Supreme Soviet and the norms of the existing administrative and criminal legislation provide a political and legal basis for ensuring high labor and social activeness and for improving the moral atmosphere in the production unit and in everyday life.

Party decisions assign importance to the education of young people and adolescents and to the prevention of violations of the law by them. Life convincingly confirms the fruitfulness of coordinated joint efforts of families, schools, the Komsomol, sports organizations, labor collectives, state organs, and the public. The "difficult adolescent" problem is connected essentially with problems within the family, errors in ideological, moral, and labor education, omissions by schools, and a lack of attention from adults. We have considerable resources for protecting the coming generation against negative phenomena. The commissions on juvenile affairs must better coordinate this work.

Law and order organs, primarily the militia, have been given the task of more actively countering encroachments on socialist property and of stepping up the struggle against embezzlement, bribery, and speculation. The Service for Combating the Embezzlement of Socialist Property and Speculation is being reinforced with principled, well-trained workers so as to increase the service's investigative and operational prestige. Its structure has been brought into line with the structure of national economic sectors. The main attention is being focused on exposing embezzlers, bribe-takers, and speculators, particularly those in construction, trade, transport, agriculture, and the light and food industry. Thus, the skillful actions of USSR MVD operators resulted in the exposure of a group of bribe-takers headed by Putintsev, chief of the Ministry of Railways Auditing Section, and Berchenko, his deputy, who, together with their accomplices, have been prosecuted.

It is equally important to eliminate petty embezzlements which ultimately develop into major losses. It is incumbent on the enterprise protection service, public monitoring, the administration, and departmental inspectorates to set a firm guard against them. However, the protection service alone is not enough to close the loopholes against "pilferers." An atmosphere of intolerance toward and universal condemnation of every instance of theft must be created within labor collectives.

The agro-industrial complex requires unremitting attention from internal affairs organs. Quite a few cases of mismanagement have come to light in stock raising, fruit and vegetable farming, and in the procurement of arable and livestock produce. And where there are losses and disorders in accounting, there also the swindler's hands reach out to take the people's wealth. Checks by the Service for Combatting the Embezzlement of Socialist Property and Speculation often turn up livestock that have not been accounted for and many products that "disappear" from slaughterhouses and meat combines. The outmoded norms of "shrinkage" and "spillage" in trade and supply facilitate and conceal many instances of embezzlement.

There are large distortions of data in transport. They amount to 40 percent at some of the installations that have been checked. At Noginsk in the Moscow region, for example, one driver wrote off 36,000 liters of gasoline from his account over 3 years by a systematic distortion of his tonnage and mileage for which he was illegally paid R11,000 and for which employees of the vehicle enterprise received $80,000 in "bonuses." Last year, the state Automobile Inspection Service discovered a considerable number of trucks with inoperative odometers.

There is considerable pilfering of railroad freight, often by transport workers themselves At Kursk station, a group of engine drivers and their assistants committed thefts worth a total of over R93,000, and the former chief of the goods yard at Samtrediya station (Georgian SSR) stole 1,300 sacks of sugar.

After discovery, the culprits got their just desserts. In conjunction with other law enforcement organs and people's and departmental control, and relying on working people's support, the militia is increasing its efforts in the prevention of embezzlement so as to "put a complete stop to such phenomena as instances of the use of state and public property and of official positions for personal profit," as the CPSU Central Committee June Plenum pointed out.

In accordance with the party's instructions, internal affairs organs are improving their work style and methods, are firmly eliminating violations of the law, manifestations of red tape, and the embellishment of the real state of law and order. A principled assessment, regardless of those concerned, is being given to instances of criminal coverups, of unjustified refusal to begin criminal proceedings, and of rudeness and disrespect toward people. A strict system for the registration of crime reports has recently been introduced whereby the person making the report is given a notification voucher. Citizens' complaints, statements, and letters are examined quickly and thoroughl and visits are made to them where necessary. The cadres of internal affairs organs are being purged of slackers and of those who are ideologically and morally immature.

The USSR MVD has sharply reduced its paperwork and report work and the number of meetings and conferences. That makes it possible to free the time of skilled leaders to work on the spot with personnel and the population. That work is geared toward ensuring that the professional knowledge of militia staffers is combined with civic bravery, incorruptibility, and justice so as to ensure that the actions of internal affairs organ staffers, in all their strictness and firmness, are always and in all things legal, just, and comprehensible to working people.

A number of practical measures have been implemented to increase ties between internal affairs organs and the public, and collaboration with procurator's office, people's control, court, and justice organs. The militia's leading links are being strengthened qualitatively and organizationally.

The CPSU Central Committee Politburo has adopted a resolution on the creation of political organs within the USSR MVD system. Their tasks include the organization and leadership of party political, ideological-educational, and cultural enlightenment work within the USSR MVD system and to increase the responsibility of personnel for the performance of their official duty. This is a new manifestation of the party's concern for the ideological and political maturity and professional skill of internal affairs organ cadres.

March 1984 marks the 25th anniversary of the creation of the People's Voluntary Militia. The militia is commemorating that date by stepping up its organizational and methodological assistance to People's Voluntary Militia staffs and by strengthening truly close cooperation in the joint protection of public order. Daily attention is paid to strenghtening ties between the public and the militia by the party committees in the cities of Nakhodka in the Maritime Kray, and Dzerzhinsk in Gorkiy Oblast, for example. City people's voluntary militia staffs, councils for preventing violations of the law, and public centers for the protection of order, backed up by leading enterprises and their voluntary militia detachments, are operating actively there. An atmosphere of exacting demand is being maintained by joint efforts, and labor discipline is being strengthened by exemplary order.

The replenishment of militia cadres by assignments from labor collectives, by command of military units, and by recommendations from party and Komsomol organizations is an expression of the indissoluble link between the people and the Soviet militia. Envoys of labor collectives deliver reports on their work to them. And they have something worth telling. Comparatively recently, in August 1980, a workshop at the Kolomenskiy diesel engine construction plant recommended the Communist, Yu. Karasev, a young lathe operator, Leninist Komsomol prizewinner, and holder of the Order of Labor Red Banner, for militia membership. Senior Lieutenant of Militia Karasev, inspector of the Kolomenskiy Rayon Internal Affairs Section, is performing exemplary service and is carrying out the instructions of the working collective honorably.

Militia service requires courage, will, selflessness, a great mobilization of spiritual and moral strength, physical tempering, and comprehenisve preparation. It is a stern, complex, and, to put it bluntly, difficult service. It brings all the more respect and esteem to those who perform it honorably. Despite serious injuries, G. Shchukin, a Moscow militiaman, disarmed and arrested a dangerous criminal in May last year. For courage and bravery he was awarded the Order of the Red Start and returned to duty after his recovery. Remarkable promtness was shown recently by Zh. Babamuradov and A. Yuldashev, divisional inspectors in Dzhizak Oblast. A motorist called them and reported the details of some armed criminals who had attacked him. Inside a few hours the divisional inspectors had arrested them.

At the same time, the work of some of our staffers and of a number of internal affairs organs causes citizens' justified dissatisfaction. There have been instances of slow responses to notifications of hooliganism and theft, and bureaucracy has been permitted in the investigation of crimes, some of which remain unsolved. The assessments by some militia leaders of the real results of the struggle against criminality have lost their trenchancy. The effectiveness of the prevention of violations of the law remains low, and the struggle against encroachments on socialist property, against speculation and bribery, is being waged only poorly.

The personnel of internal affairs organs are assessing their work self-critically and are deeply aware of the high demands of the party, the government, and the people, on the protection of public order and the strengthening of legality. Much is now being done to finally overcome shortcomings, to ensure the maximum efficiency of law enforcement activity, and, on that basis, to increase the Soviet militia's professional prestige.

VOROTNIKOV CHAIRS RSFSR GOVERNMENT SESSION

PM111253 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 10 Aug 83 First Edition p 1

[Unattributed report: "At the RSFSR Council of Ministers"]

[Text] A routine session of the RSFSR Council of Ministers Presidium has discussed preparations being made in the area of housing and municipal services for operating in winter conditions. More than one-half of the housing stock and of gas, water and heat supply facilities are ready for operation in the cold period. Around 40 percent of the boiler houses have been overhauled and fuel stocks are being established. In general the situation is somewhat better than last year, but there is still much to do. In a number of autonomous republics, krays and oblasts there has been a considerable lag in capital and performing repairs on housing, heat and power facilities, urban electric transport and water supply facilities. Construction departments are delaying startup work at a number of heat and power facilities. The RSFSR Council of Minister Presidium ordered the Ministry of Housing and Municipal Services, local ispolkoms and interested ministries and departments to take more vigorous and coordinated steps to ensure that housing and social, consumer and municipal facilities are ready in good time for winter operation.

RSFSR Trade Minister V.I. Shimanksiy reported on the fulfillment of targets on the development of trade in the 11th 5-Year Plan. It was noted that there are still serious shortcomings in the Trade Ministry's organizational work. The leaders of the Trade Ministry and wholesale and retail organizations have not taken enough steps to increase trade's influence on industry in order to expand the output of goods of the requisite range and quality, they are too lax when it comes to making sure that contract deliveries are made and they are not managing commodity resources properly. Trade departments often adopt the passive position of middleman between industry and purchaser. The RSFSR Council of Ministers Presidium demanded that the leaders of the republic's Trade Ministry drastically reorganize their work style and methods in line with present-day conditions and demands.

There was a consideration of the question of serious shortcomings in the planning, construction and operation of the facilities of the "Atommash" Production Association and of the city of Volgodonsk. A number of officials were penalized for errors and mistakes, for an irresponsible attitude toward the organization of the commissioning of projects and for failing to exercise adequate control over the quality of construction. Measures were outlined to eliminate the consequences of the errors and mistakes as soon as possible. The RSFSR Council of Ministers Presidium charged the republic's ministries and departments and local ispolkoms with the task of taking immediate steps to fundamentally improve the leadership of their planning and research organizations and to strengthen state discipline in these organizations.

The RSFSR Council of Ministers Presidium examined a number of other matters. The leaders of ministries and departments were told to pay special attention to intensifying work on the successful completion of the plan for economic and social development in 1983. The session was chaired by V.I. Vorotnikov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers.

CPSU'S KUNAYEV VISITS URALSK OBLAST FARMS

PM120817 Alma-Ata KAZAKHSTANSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 3 Aug 83 p 1

[KAZTAG report: "Much Grain from the Urals Region for the Motherland"]

[Text] Rural workers in Uralsk Oblast are now working in a good frame of mind, confidently stepping up their contribution to the implementation of the Food Program. Implementing the decisions of the 26th CPSU Congress, subsequent CPSU Central Committee plenums, and the 15th Kazakhstan Communist Party Congress, they have grown a good harvest and have embarked on the decisive days of harvest toil, the days of struggle to fulfill and considerably overfulfill their high socialist pledges for grain sale to the state. The front of intensive procurement of feed for all sectors of public livestock raising is spreading. The targets set are being reached by many leading collectives in other sectors of the economy.

Comrade D.A. Kunayev, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the Kazakhstan Communist Party Central Committee, visited the oblast's farms. On the Druzhba, Kirov, Lenin, and 20th Party Congress kolkhozes and the Uralskiy Fruit and Vegetable sovkhoz, he familiarized himself with the course of work in the fields and met with machine operators, farm leaders and specialists, and party, soviet, trade union, and Komsomol workers.

In a talk with Hero of Socialist Labor I.K. Shkilev, team leader of a comprehensive team of communist labor at the Lenin kolkhoz, he inquired in detail into the villagers' working and living conditions and drew attention to the importance of ideological backup for work in full accordance with the requirements of the CPSU Central Committee June (1983) Plenum and the 10th Kazakhstan Communist Party Central Committee Plenum. A good example is set here by the press group of the Lenin kolkhoz party committee, which skillfully propagandizes the labor achievements of front-runners and innovators in agricultural production. Like many farms in the Urals region, the Lenin kolkhoz has already met its plan for grain sales to the state and is waging a struggle to give two annual plans in the third year of the 5-Year Plan.

In the oblast center Comrade D.A. Kunayev visited a metal goods plant, where he talked with workers and specialists and noted the need to extend the range of goods for the people and improve their quality. In particular, the Uralsk workers must ensure an increase in the production of high quality consumer goods, milk separators, and kitchenware. Comrade D.A. Kunayev inspected the new Akzhaik hotel complex and the railroad station which is under construction and visited the Museum of Scientific Atheism.

On 2 August there was a meeting of the oblast party aktiv, at which M.B. Iksanov, first secretary of the Kazakhstan Communist Party Obkom, reported on the work being done in the oblast to ensure the successful implementation of plans and socialist pledges for the third year and the 5-year plan as a whole.

Briefings on the state of economic affairs were given by party raykom First Secretaries A.V. Baybulatov of Akzhaikskiy Rayon, N.A. Pashko of Burlinskiy Rayon, and N.Ye. Bolbatov of Zelenovskiy Rayon; Hero of Socialist Labor V.I. Shubin, director of the PRAVDA sovkhoz; S.O. Gusmanov, chairman of the Rodina kolkhoz; and S.G. Musin, leader of a tractor fieldwork team at the Lubenskiy sovkhoz.

The aktiv meeting was addressed by Comrade D.A. Kunayev, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the Kazakhstan Communist Party Central Committee, who was warmly greeted by those present. He noted the significant work done by the oblast party organization and all working people in Kazakhstan's Urals region in the sphere of the rural economy and other sectors of the national economy.

Now, he stressed, our common task is the unconditional fulfillment of party decisions and the instructions and recommendations of Comrade Yu.V. Andropov, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium. The main thing now is to carry out the harvesting in a short space of time and without losses, to ensure high productivity and quality of labor everywhere, to strive for efficient collaboration between all components of the agro-industrial complex, and to distribute manpower and technical resources as rationally as possible.

Along with the grain harvest, it is necessary to step up the rate of feed procurement, deliveries of feed to livestock wintering places, and the preparation of seed and land for next year's harvest. There must be more active work to introduce the collective contract method in the countryside and disseminate other efficient forms of labor organization and incentives. The greatest attention should be paid to questions of further developing all sectors of public livestock raising, extending the network of subsidiary farms, and increasing their yield.

Comrade D.A. Kunayev noted the need for constant concern for the development of industry and construction, for bringing the laggards up to the frontrunners' level, and for increasing the technical and economic indicators of the so-called "average" collectives. It is necessary to strive persistently to speed up housing construction, improve its quality, and improve the work of trade and consumer enterprises and health and culture institutions.

The major tasks set by the party for improving ideological and educational activity make strict demands on every party organization and on soviet, trade union, and Komsomol organ and the mass media. Comrade D.A. Kunayev stressed the importance of constantly strengthening labor and performance discipline, increasing responsibility for the tasks set, raising the political consciousness and ideological and moral level of every working person, and supporting valuable undertakings and initiatives aimed at fulfilling ahead of schedule the targets and socialist pledges for the year and for the whole of the 11th 5-Year Plan.

The meeting expressed confidence that Communists and all working people in the oblast will harvest the crop and carry out other agricultural operations at the best possible time and without losses, will considerably overfulfill socialist pledges for grain sales to the state, will cope with plans for the sale of other agricultural products, and will ensure the steady development of industry, construction, and other sectors of the economy and culture.

Taking part in the aktiv meeting were V.K. Kadyrbayev, Kazakh SSR minister of motor transport, and R.T. Turganbayev, chief of the West Kazakhstan Railroad Directorate.

Comrade D.A. Kunayev was accompanied in his tour of the oblast by M.B. Iksanov, first secretary of the Kazakhstan Communist Party Obkom, and V.I. Podyablonskiy, chairman of the Oblispolkom.

KUZNETSOV VISITS LATVIAN AGRO-INDUSTRIAL BODY

PM120908 Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA in Russian 3 Aug 83 p 1

[LATINFORM report: "Visit to the Talsinskiy Rayon Agro-Industrial Association"]

[Text] V.V. Kuznetsov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, who is on vacation in our republic, visited the Talsinskiy Rayon Agro-Industrial Association on 2 August. He was accompanied by A.E. Voss, first secretary of the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee.

As is well known, the experience of the Talsinskiy Rayon Agro-industrial Association was assessed highly at the CPSU Central Committee June (1983) Plenum, where it was noted that the Talsinskiy Party Raykom, like a number of other party committees, has approached the creation of agro-industrial associations as a problem of forming new relations between people linked by a single goal, a single interest, and responsibility for the end results of their joint work.

K.K. Rutenberg, first secretary of Talsinskiy party raykom, P.P. Ovdak, chairman of Talsinskiy Rayispolkom, and V.Zh. Kleynberg, chairman of the Talsinskiy Rayon Agro-Industrial Association Council, spoke of the experience of organizational, political, and ideological work under the conditions of the rayon agro-industrial association.

V.V. Kuznetsov inquired specifically about the work of local soviets and their participation in general efforts to implement plans for economic and sociocultural building, the intensification of agricultural production, and the implementation of the Food Program.

At the Lenin kolkhoz certain production, cultural, and consumer facilities were inspected. There were talks with the local aktiv and with specialists in agricultural production, in the course of which there was a discussion of how rural workers are fulfilling the decisions of the CPSU Central Committee June (1983) Plenum and implementing the instructions and recommendations contained in the speech by Comrade Yu.V. Andropov, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, at the plenum.

Questions connected with the coming into force of the USSR Law on Labor Collectives and on Increasing Their Role in the Management of Enterprises, Institutions, and Organizations were also discussed.

MORALITY OF ECONOMIC LEADERS DISCUSSED

PM111932 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 9 Aug 83 p 1

[Editorial: "Authority of the Leader"]

[Excerpts] No post guarantees authority and respect of itself; these must be won and backed up by deeds. In assessing the style of leadership of economic cadres, the party considers it essential to take into account the standard of educational work and discipline and the moral and political climate in the collective over and above the production plan fulfillment indicators. And the former are determined to a large extent by the leader's personality, moral purity, ideological maturity, and ability to win over those surrounding him.

Having the moral right to be a leader means being consistent in all things, both great and small, and always being guided by state interests.

"It is exceptionally important," Yu.V. Andropov stressed in his speech at the CPSU Central Committee June (1983) Plenum "to seek to ensure that words never diverge from deeds and that the essentials are not replaced by mere form." This is just how most leaders act. But there are economic leaders who make an obvious distinction between words and deeds. At meetings, for instance, they appeal to others to look after public property, but how do they act themselves? Over the last 3 years leaders of the Irkutsk Scientific Research Institute of Rare and Nonferrous Metals have built -- illegally and at the state's expense -- a dacha and a bathhouse. They spent a lot of funds on maintaining a motor ship, which the Institute's director, Comrade Savchenko, used for his personal lesure on Lake Baykal.

Will such a leader be trusted by his subordinates? Hardly. In their eyes he has lost the moral right to give the lead to others.

A leader's ideological maturity is often and rightly judged by his ability to accept criticism. An intelligent and farsighted leader will always know how to draw a useful lesson from this. Another, on the other hand, will suddenly feel the pangs of wounded pride, and will see the criticism as an attack on his prestige and authority.

Such a man assails his "enemy" with all the force of the power vested in him, often making use of methods incompatible with party principles and our ethical norms. In so doing he assumes his official position and his mangerial seat give him the right to a special place among those surrounding him, the right to exclusiveness and to infallibility. The leader who suppresses criticism, the careerist, and the moneygrubber cause great harm, for people sometimes judge our methods by their actions.

Communist ethics are unshakeable tenets of our party rules and our Constitution. And, of course, Communist leaders are called on to set an example, to display exemplary observance of themoral principles and norms held in our society. Their aspirations and actions should be determined by profound ideological convictions.

The holy of holies for a leader is the observance of the laws which protect the interests of society and the rights of citizens. "In particular, it is necessary to completely put an end to phenomena such as instances of the use of states and public property and official position for the purpose of personal enrichment," the CPSU Central Committee June Plenum noted. "After all, if we think about it, this is mone other than the undermining of the very essence of our system."

The lawbreaker, who is also consequently the violator of the demands of party discipline which are the same for everybody, by his actions undermines the party's authority, and that means, he puts himself outside the party. Quite recently the CPSU Central Committee Party Control Committee expelled from the party I. Ignatov, chief of a Social Technological Design Bureau of the Ukrainian SSR Academy of Sciences Kiev Mechanics Institute for write-ups, deception, and abuse of official position for selfish purposes. He was relieved of his post.

It is not easy to be a leader. Great responsibilities are on his shoulders. To fulfill the tasks set by the party's 26th Congress and the CPSU Central Committee June Plenum and to cope successfully with the plan targets for the year and for the 5-year period, it is necessary to constantly improve the organizer's and educator's skill and be equal to the moral demands of our socialist society.